

HISTORY OF GRAMMATICAL THEORIES IN TAMIL

BY

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI,

Principal, Raja's College of Skt. and Tamil Studies, Tiruvadi.

NĪR and *NĪRKAL* are mentioned by the author of *Vīracōliyam*. *Nīr* is only the contracted form of *nīyir* or *nīvir*, and *nīrkal* is evidently double plural. Its commentator mentions that, sometimes, *nīyirkal* and *nīvirkal* also are used.¹

NĪM is found in *Cīvakacintāmaṇi* and it is stated in its commentary that it is a *ticai-c-col*. It may have been borrowed from Canarese or may have been formed from *nī* through analogy with *nām*, *tām*, etc. This form is not found in any work written before *Cīvakacintāmaṇi*.

NĪYIR, *NĪVIR* and *NĪR* are mentioned by the author of *Nannūl*. *Nīvir* may have been formed by the substitution of *v* for *y* between *ī* and *i* in *nī + ir* through analogy with *ivviṭam* (*i-v-v-iṭam*), etc. Since it is not mentioned by *Tolkāppiyaṇār* and it is not found in the earlier Sangam works, it may have been of later origin.

NĪNKAL is a double plural formed from the plural *nīm*. This form is not found in works written before *Cīvakacintāmaṇi*. It is the only form that is now very largely used not only as honorific singular like *nīr* but also as plural.

The following quotations may serve as examples for the forms mentioned above :—

Nīyō peruma (you are great). (P. N. 5.3.)

Ninnai y-innāturra v-araṇil kūrrē (the god of death who has unmeritoriously taken away your life). (P.N. 255.3.)

Ninnotu puraiya (to fight with you). (Pari. 11.67.)

Ninakku irumpu tanmai (your wonderful quality).
(Pari. 23.3.)

Ninnin ciṛanta nin tāḷinaṭai (your feet which are superior to you). (Pari. 29.62.)

Nīyiru m-irunilaṇ kaṭanta (even you having crossed the wide tract). (Pattu. 131.28.)

1. V. V. 9. comm. cf. f. n. under 4.1 *supra*.

Varutu nīyirum (you too better come). (Pattu. 100.143.)

Nīr...tolūminē (you better worship). (T. 19.1.)

Nīr tuḷaṅkal vēṇṭā (you will not desire). (C. C. 745.)

Aṭiyēṇ vantaṭaivaṇimē (I, the slave, will resort to you).
(C. C. 563.)

Nīṅkaḷ nōkkumin (you better see). (C. C. 1045.)

Nīyir aivīrum (you five). (Kampar. A. 725.67.)

Uṅkaḷ kulattu tittōrkaṭkellām (to all who are born in
your family). (Kampar. K. 247.78.)

What is the origin of the base 'UN' in the singular found in the medieval and modern periods? It seems to me that it was evolved out of the base *nin* of the ancient period in the following way:—First of all we see the form *nun* used in the following sentences:—

Nuna cīraṭi nōva (to make your little feet suffer).
(C. C. 1517.)

Nunṭati-ṭ-ṭeyarkkum (going to your residence). (P. K.
i, 32.93.)

of *Cīvakacintāmaṇi* and *Peruṅkatai*, respectively, works written between the 9th and 10th cent. A. D. *Nun* may have been formed from *nin* by changing *i* to *u* through analogy with the vowel *u* found in the plural base *num*. Then in collocations like *nuṅkō-nunṇai*, . . (M. M. 283.100) which admit of being split up in two ways—*nuṅkōṇ + nunṇai* and *nuṅkōṇ + unṇai*, the latter alternative may have been adopted, and thus the form *un* may have come into being. Now that the first appearance of *un* is accounted for, it would scarcely be difficult to imagine how such a form may easily have become generalised. The following illustrations would make clear how such wrong splittings not infrequently serve as fruitful sources of new doublets in phrases involving sandhi between final *n* and initial *n*.

For instance in *nōurru mūttu nānuntu kaṇrā* (T. V. 1037.), the expression *nānuntu* is shown by Dr. Pope to be capable of being split in two ways as *nān + nuntu* and *nān + untu* though the earlier form *nuntu* appears in the sentence *nuntum paṇṭaṭṭerumai* (T. V. 6.187). From this it will be seen how the doublet *untu* arose beside the earlier *nuntu*. Similarly in 'ṭuṭalvarār polintānuntai' found in the *Vipīṭaṇaṇ-āṭaikkala-p-paṭalam* of the *Yuttakāṇṭam* in *Kamparāmāyaṇam*, the expression *polintānuntai* was wrongly split into *polintān* and *untai* and the doublet *untai* arose beside the earlier *nuntai* recognised by *Tolkāppiyaṇār*. (Cf. Tol. E. 67.)

Forms with the base *un* are not at all found in the early works of Sangam period like *Puranānūru*, *Akanānūru* etc. They begin to appear in very few instances in *Maṇimēkalai* and are freely used in *Tēvāram*, *Tiruvācakam*, *Nālāyirappirapantam* and other works written between the 5th and 9th centuries and they have almost ousted the old forms with the base *nin* in the modern period. The following may serve as examples for the same.

Nin peruntunṇam (your great suffering). (M.M. 172.43.)

Orutani ninrāy unṇiram arintēn (you stood alone and I understood your power). (M. M. 50.96.)

Unṇaṭiyēn unai ninaintāl (if I, your servant think of you). (T. 31.2.) (*unai* for *unṇai*).

Unṇai yān pirinta nāl (the day when I gave birth to you). (C. C. 2100.)

Unatu aṭiyē caraṇamē (your feet are my refuge). (P. T. 150.9.)

Unmēl ātaram peritū (regard for you is great). (P. T. 46.9.)

Un maṇattāl (with your mind). (P. T. 44.1.)

Un aṭiyār-tāl paṇivōm (we will worship the feet of your devotees). (T. V. 7.36.)

Unakkē aṭaikkalam (we are under you). (T. V. 7.73.)

Unṇai-p-pirān-āka (thinking you a stranger). (T. V. 7.35.)

Similarly the base *num* may have been replaced by *um*. Then the particle *kaḷ* may have been added to the base *um* so that we have two bases *um* and *uṇkaḷ*. In modern times, the base *um* is used in connection with honorific singular, and *uṇkaḷ* with plural. The following may serve as examples for the same :—

Umakku inta nāṭṭē vantu toṇṭarāṇa nāṇkaḷ (we who have come to this country and become your devotees). (P. T. 93.7.)

Umakke āḷāy (being your men). (P. T. 92.4.)

Uṇkaḷ kulattutittōrkkellām (to all who have been born in your family). (Kampar. K. 247.78.)

NŌKKŪ : The first syllable in *unakkū* is dropped on the principle of economy of effort and *a* is made the guttaro-labial vowel *o* by the influence of the labial *u*, before it is dropped.

The existence of two different bases *nin* and *num* in the ancient period for the oblique cases respectively of the second

person singular and second person plural in Tamil is similar to that of the base *tvat* and *yuṣmat* in the singular and plural of the second person in Sanskrit. Also the element 'm' is found in the plural bases of both.

COLLECTIVE SECOND PERSONAL PRONOUN : Tolkāp-piyanār mentions that *ellīrum* is second person and should be declined as *ellīr-nummaiyum*, *ellīr-nummoṭum*, etc. (Tol.E. 192). Naṇṇūlār mentions *elīr* in the nominative case (Na. 287) and *ellīrnummaiyum*, etc. in the oblique cases (Na. 246). Besides *ellām* may be used along with the oblique cases of the second person. But at present, the use of the oblique case forms of *ellīrum* have died out and those of *ellārum*, the demonstrative form in *uyartiṇai* and its poetical form *ellōrum* are used instead. e.g. *uṇkaḷ ellāraiyum vara-c-conṇāḷ* or *uṇkaḷ ellōraiyum vara-c-conṇāḷ* (She asked all of you to come). Sanskrit does not possess a similar collective second personal pronoun.

3.213322. **DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS** are of three kinds :—(1) Remote Demonstrative Pronoun (2) Proximate Demonstrative Pronoun and (3) Intermediate Demonstrative Pronoun.

3.2133221. **REMOTE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN** assumes in the ancient period the following forms in the nominative case—*avan* in masculine singular, *aval* in feminine singular, *avar* in epicene plural, *atu* or *aṣṭi* in neuter singular and *avai* and *av* in neuter plural. (e.g.) *avvum piṇavum* (they and others) (Pari. 26.23). But in medieval and modern periods there are two forms *avar* and *avarkaḷ* in epicene plural and two forms *avai* and *avaikaḷ* in neuter plural. The oblique cases are formed by adding case-suffixes to the nominative forms without any change.

3.2133222. Similarly the forms of the **PROXIMATE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN** in the nominative case are *ivan*, *ival*, *ivar* and *ivarkaḷ*, *itu* or *iṣṭi* and *ivai*, *iv* and *ivaikaḷ*. (e.g.) *ivvum uvvum* (these and those) (Pari. 26.23). The oblique cases too are formed in the same manner as in the Remote Demonstrative Pronoun.

3.2133223. Similarly the forms of the **INTERMEDIATE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN** in the nominative case are *uvan*, *uval*, *uvar*, *utu* or *uṣṭi*, *uvai* and *uv*. These forms are gradually going out of use.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar¹ says, 'Old Tamil usage, however, clearly indicates that, in its inception, *u* was a far demonstrative and it is used as such in the Oldest Tamil works.' He derives *u* from *ava* through the intermediate stages *ō* and *ū*. Then he says that 'the demonstrative element *u* is of comparatively late origin.' The examples he quotes where *u*, according to him, is far demonstrative are from works which are later than Tolkāppiyam. In Tolkāppiyam, *uvaṇ*, *uval*, *utu* and *uvai* are mentioned along with *avaṇ*, *aval*, *atu* and *avai*. If both the demonstrative elements *a* and *u* had had the same function at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār, one of them would have died out even at his time. 'U' may have been used in his time to denote objects at a distance and *a* to denote objects at remote distance.

Avar and *ivar* were used as honorific singular and *avarkaḷ* and *ivarkaḷ* as plurals at the time of the author of Vīracōliyam (V. V. 9.). But now *avar*, *avarkaḷ*, *ivar* and *ivarkaḷ* are all used both as honorific singular and plural. The *a* in Tamil *avaṇ*, *aval*, etc., and *i* in *ivaṇ*, *ival*, etc. respectively have their parallels in Sanskrit, in *a* of *tat* and *i* of *idam*.

There was a collective third person plural pronoun which had the form of *ellārum* in the nominative case and *ellārtammai-yum*, *ellārtammoṭum*, etc. in the oblique cases. The insertion of *tam* is almost extinct in modern speech. Similarly, *ellām* in the nominative case and *ellānammai-yum*, *ellānammoṭum*, etc. and *ellāvarrai-yum* and *ellāvarroṭum*, etc. in the oblique cases were used along with pronouns of the epicene plural and neuter plural respectively. (Tol. E. 190 and 191.) Even in ancient period the forms *ellārai-yum* and *ellāroṭum*, etc. were used in place of *ellānammai-yum*, *ellānammoṭum*, etc. e.g. *kaṭavulaḷ ellārkkum* (to all gods). (Ka. T. ii, 559.36.) In the later periods if they are used along with the nouns in oblique cases which they qualify, the nominative form itself is used. e.g. *uyirkkelām* (to all living beings). (Kampar. B. 3312.)

3.213323. REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS are respectively *tāṇ* and *tām* in the nominative singular and plural. They are shortened to *taṇ* and *tam* in the oblique cases before they take case-suffixes. *Tām* also takes *kaḷ* in the modern period as other pronouns. The form *tāṇkaḷ* is now used as an honorific second

1. "Āryan Affinities of Dravidian Pronoun" read in the Third All India Oriental Conference, Madras, p. 7.

person singular also, when it is followed by a verb of the second person plural.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar says that "*tan* was in its inception merely a pronoun of the third person, and that a reflexive meaning has come to be superimposed so as to overshadow its original sense to such an extent that it has now come to be called the Reflexive Pronoun"¹ From the examples he has quoted it seems to me that the reverse may have been the case; for since there were the demonstrative pronouns *avan*, *aval*, *atu*, etc., there would be no need for another kind of pronoun of the third person in *tān*. Tolkāppiyaṇār states that *tān* and *tām* are respectively used in the singular and plural. He has not mentioned that they should be used only in the third person; besides, from the context of the sūtras dealing with *tān* and *tām*, it is clear that he thinks that they could be used along with the pronouns of all persons and genders. Since the examples quoted by R. Swaminatha Aiyar are from works later than Tolkāppiyam, it seems to me that *tān* and *tām* were originally reflexive in origin and their use has been so extended that they are used even as demonstrative pronouns.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar traces *tān* to R. V. *tanu* and *tām* to *tman*² but in the present state of my knowledge, I cannot agree with him.

3.213324. *INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN*: The forms of Interrogative Pronouns that are found in Tolkāppiyam are *yāvan*, *yāval*, *yāvar*, *yāar*, *yār*, *yāvatū*, *yā*, *yāvai*, and *evan*. Tolkāppiyaṇār says that *yāar* can be used as the logical predicate of masculine singular noun, feminine singular noun and epicene plural nouns,³ and that *evan* may be used along with neuter singular and neuter plural⁴ and also when the gender of the object that is questioned is not clear.⁵ The oblique forms too

1. *Ibid.* p. 45.

2. *Ibid.* p. 47.

3. *Yāa r-ennum vināvin kilavi*

A-t-tinai maruṅkin mu-p-pārku m-urittē.

(Tol. Col. 219.)

4. *A-t-tinai maruṅki n-iru-pār kilavikkum*

Okku m-enpa v-evan-en vināvē. (ibid. 219.)

5. *Yātu-eva n-enṇu m-āyiru, kilaviyum*

Ariyā-p poruḷ-vayir ceriya-t tōṇrum. (ibid. 31.)

at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār had the base *yā*. In the medieval period *evaikaḷ* and *evarkaḷ* also were used. In the modern period the forms, *evaṇ*, *evaḷ*, *evār*, *etu* and *evai*, *evaṇai*, *evaḷai*, *evarai*, *etai* or *etanai*, *evārṇai* have almost taken the place of *yāvaṇ*, *yāvaḷ*, *yāvar*, *yāṭu*, *yāvai*, *yāvaṇai*, *yāvaḷai*, *yāvarai*, *yātai* or *yātanai*, *yāvarṇai*, etc. Hence the original interrogative root was *yā*. But Tolkāppiyaṇār himself mentions an interrogative form *evaṇ* and takes *ē* as one interrogative root and makes use of such words as *e-ṭ-ṭorul*, *e-ṭ-ṭeyar*, etc. Hence it seems to me that, before the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār, *yā* may have been the base of the forms in the nominative case e.g. *yāvarum ṭirarum*—(Pari. 55.8.) and *e* the base of forms in the oblique cases and that, at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār, the base *yā* was generalised throughout e.g. *yāvarkkum cāyal niṇatu*—(Pari. 9.55.) and at the later periods *e* began to be generalised throughout e.g. *evaṇum itai-c-ceyvāṇ* (any one can do this), *evarkkum itu eḷitū*, (this is easy for any one to do) etc.—(Colloq.)

Dr. Caldwell thinks that *yā* was the original form and that *ē* must have been corrupted from it. But since the root *e* is found in the form *evaṇ* mentioned by him and *ē* is used as syntactic interrogative from the earliest times, it is also probable that *e* or *ē* may have been the original and *yā* may have been formed from it through analogy with *yāṇ*, which may have been formed from the oblique base *eṇ*.

In addition to these interrogative pronouns, there are three interrogative roots, *ā*, *ē* and *ō* which serve as syntactic interrogatives and are added at the end of nouns or verbs. e.g. *Avanā vantāṇ* ? (did he come). *Avan vantāṇā* ? (did he come). *Avanē vantāṇ* ? (did he come). *Avanō vantāṇ* ? (did he come). *Avan vantāṇō* ? (did he come). Some of these as *ā* and *ō* denote mere question and the third *ē* denotes doubt etc.

3.213325. *RELATIVE PRONOUNS*: Tolkāppiyaṇār and other grammarians have not stated anything about relative pronouns. The purpose of the relative pronouns is served by the participles e.g.

Uṇṭi-koṭuttōr uyir-koṭuttōrē (food-givers are life givers).
(P.N. 18.19.)

Ceyvinai-k-k-etirnta tevvar (enemies who were against
the actions done). (P.N. 6.11.)

Nirayaṇ kolṭavarotū (with those who go to hell). (P.N.
5.6.)

Cērvāṇa i-k-kaṇṭāl (if you see him who will mix with you). (T. 25.2.)

But in *Maṇimēkalai* and some of the later works the interrogative pronouns began to be used in certain instances as relative pronouns. This, it seems to me, is due to the adaptation of Sanskrit sentence form in Tamil. For instance, sentences like '*yātonru yātonru mūrttam atu anittam*' (whichever is *mūrta* is *anitya*) are found in plenty in *Maṇimēkalai*. This sentence is exactly the translation of the Sanskrit sentence '*yat yat mūrtam, tat tat anityam*'. The same idea may be expressed in Tamil as '*mūrttam ānatu anittam*'.

R. Swaminatha Aiyar says that "the Sanskrit masculine *yāvān* appears to have been one of the earliest relative interrogative forms adopted in Tamil and other Dravidian languages". Two points are to be noted here :—(1) *Yāvān* is only a relative pronoun in Sanskrit and is never an interrogative, and it exists from a very ancient period; while the relative pronoun in Tamil is a recent introduction and *yāvaṇ* in Tamil was originally an interrogative pronoun; (2) Besides, if *yāvaṇ* was derived from *yāvān*, why should the second 'a' be shortened in Tamil? Again he says, "the interrogative *e* which appears initially in composition as in Tamil *e-p-peyar* . . . has apparently arisen from the imitation of such Sanskrit compounds and combinations as *yat-kāma* . . . *yatkarāṇa*, etc. This *e* is another of the earliest relative interrogative forms adopted in the Dravidian languages. It is possible that the base *yad* has also given rise to the Dravidian pronouns, *edu*, *edi*." This appears to me to be an extreme view. The form *etu* in Tamil is only of later origin. The corresponding form is *yāvatū* in *Tolkāppiyam*. The *e* of *e-k-kālam* is formed in the same way as *a-k-kālam*, *i-k-kālam*, since, as Dr. Caldwell says, 'the Demonstrative and Interrogative bases are built up on those bases in precisely the same manner and obey one and the same law.'

3.213326. PRONOUNS DERIVED FROM NUMERALS :

They are of two kinds, viz., *oruvan*, *orubar*, *irubar*, *mūvar*, etc. which belong to *uyartiṇai* and *onru*, *iraṇṭu*, *mūnru*, etc., which belong to *aṣṟiṇai*. The oblique cases of the former set of words are formed by adding the case-suffixes directly to them. In the modern period the forms *iruvarkaḷaiyum*, *iruvarkaḷālum*, etc. which are formed by adding the suffix *kaḷ* to *irubar*, *mūvar*, etc., and adding the case-suffixes are also in use. The oblique cases

of the latter set of words are generally formed by adding the flexional increment *an* between them and the case-suffixes. e.g. *onṛanaiyum*, *iranṭanaiyum*, etc. The form *oruvar* was used at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār when the speaker was not sure whether the person he spoke of was a man or a woman. 'R' in *oruvar* does not denote plural number.

3.213327. INDEFINITE PRONOUNS: *ṭalla*, *ṭala*, *cila*, *ulla*, *illa*—these words which correspond to indefinite pronouns are included by Tolkāppiyaṇār in the list of *aṣṛiṇai* words. Evidently they are plurals. Their oblique cases are formed by adding the flexional increment *varru* after them and before case-suffixes. e.g. *ṭalla-varrai*, *cila-varrai*, etc.

Palar and *cilar* are not mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṇār in the list of *uyartiṇai* nouns; yet he makes use of *ṭalar* in the sūtra '*ṭalarari collē* (Tol. Col. 7). They are found freely used in Puraṇānūri and other works later than Tolkāppiyam. e.g. *māynticiṇōr ṭalarē* (many have died). (P.N. 27.6.) *ṭāṭṭum uṭaiyōr cilarē* (there are a few who have songs composed on them). (P. N. 27.5.)

The word *ṭira* also may be placed on a level with *ṭalla*, *ṭala*, etc. In the medieval period, *kaḷ* came to be added to it. e.g. *ṭoyṭṭoruḷ ṭirakaḷ* (other unreal objects). (C. C. 468.) *cilai-kaḷum ṭirakaḷum* (and other stones). (C. C. 2158). From *ṭira*, the form of *ṭirar* may have been evolved. e.g. *ṭirar vēṇṭu ṭulum* (land desired by others). (Pattu. 197.80): *ṭirarum kūṭi* (even others having joined). (Pattu. 232.518.) This too got the addition of *kaḷ* in the medieval period. e.g. *ṭiranta-v-akkulaṭavikaḷ ṭirarkaḷ yāvarum* (those born infants and others). (C. C. 2834.)

3.214. NUMERALS: 3.2141. CARDINALS: According to Tolkāppiyaṇār, *onṛu*, *iranṭu*, etc. are considered *ṭeyar* when they mean one person or object, two persons or objects, etc.¹. The number corresponding to *seven* is *ēḷ* at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār, while *ēḷu* has displaced it in the later periods. There is a tendency at the present day to use the word *orupaṭu* in place of *ṭattu*. It seems this tendency existed even in the ancient period (cf. Tol. E. 471 and 472) and in the 12th century since it is found in the inscriptions of that period. e. g. *nūṛṛoru-*

1. cf. *Inaitteṇa-k kiḷakku m-eṇṇu-k-kuri-ṭ-ṭeyarum* in Tol. Col. 168. cf. F. N. 10 in p. 87.

pattēlum (one hundred and seven). (S. I. I. iii, i. 72.13 :) *irunūr-rorupattum* (two hundred and ten). (S. I. I. iii, i. 78.5.)

The substantive numerals, except *onrū* are sometimes used as numeral adjectives. e.g. *iraṇṭu maṇitarkaḷ* (two men). When they are used as adjectives, they are not declined as in Sanskrit, i.e., whatever be the case of the noun that it qualifies, only the nominative form is used. e.g. *iraṇṭu maṇitarai*, *mūnru makkaḷāl* etc.

3.2142. *ORDINAL NUMBERS* are formed in Tamil directly from the cardinal numbers by adding *ām*, the shortened form of the verbal participle *ākum*. Hence we get the forms *onrām*, *iraṇṭām*, etc. Similarly *āvatu* is added in place of *ām*. Hence we get the forms *onrāvatū*, *iraṇṭāvatū* etc. Besides there is another form *mutal* for the first ordinal.

3.22. *VERBS*: 3.221. *DEFINITION*: Tolkāppiyaṇār states that *viṇai* does not take the case-suffix but is found generally denoting the tense also¹. This is taken to be the definition of verb by his commentators; but it seems to me that Tolkāppiyaṇār did not intend it to be so, since the word *kālamotu* in the above sūtra suggests that the verb denotes something else besides time, and the word *ninaiyuṅkālai* suggests that it is not compulsory that the verb should always denote time. This is borne out by the fact that the *kuṛippu-viṇai* or appellative verb like *kāṇakanāṭṇai* (you are the lord of jungle tract) (P. N. 5.3.) does not denote time. Hence, in my opinion, Tolkāppiyaṇār does not intend this sūtra to be the definition of *viṇai* or verb. Then one may ask what its definition is. I think that he suggests it by the name *viṇai* itself which means action. In choosing that term he may have had in his mind the statements '*tad ākhyātam yēna bhāvam*' (R. V. P. 12.5.) and *kriyāvācakam ākhyātam* (S. Y. V. P. 8.46).

The author of *Vīracōliyam* also does not attempt to define *viṇai*, but suggests it by his word '*tolir paṭam*' in V.K. 1. The author of *Nēminātam* repeats '*viṇai-y-eṇa-p-paṭupa . . .*' (Tol. Col. 198.) But Naṇṇūlār seems to define *viṇai* as that which denotes *ceypavaṇ* or doer, *karuvi* or instrument, *nilam* or place, *ceyal* or action, *kālam* or time and *ceyporuḷ* or object². This

1. *Viṇai y-eṇa-p paṭuvatu vērrumai kollātu*
Ninaiyuṅkālai-k kālamotu tōnrum. (Tol. Col. 198.)

2. *Ceypavaṇ karuvi nilaṇ ceyal kālam*
Ceyporuḷ ārum taruvatu viṇaiyē. (Na. 320.)

cannot be its definition since a verb cannot denote all the above six things but generally only action and time and person. It is almost certain that this sūtra is only an adaptation of the sūtra

Vinai-y-ē ceyvatu ceya-p-paṭu porulē
Nilan-ē kālaṇ karuvi y-enṛā
Innatar k-itu-paya r-āka r-ennum
Anna maraṇi n-iraṇṭoṭu-n tokaii
Ā-y-eṭ t-enṇa tolin-muta nilaiyē. (Tol. Col. 112.)

where it is said that, generally, eight things precede an action, i.e., *vinai*¹ or *kṛti* mentioned by Sanskrit logicians, *ceyvatu* or doer, *ceyappaṭuporuḷ* or object, *nilam* or place, *kālam* or time, *karuvi* or instrument, *innatar* or the recipient of the result of the action and *itu payan* or the purpose of the action. Tol-kāppiyanār does not seem to intend this sūtra as a definition of the verb.

The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam seems to have seen this defect in Naṇṇūlār's definition of *vinai* and also seems to have noted that the sūtra '*vinai y-ena-p-paṭuva* (Tol. Col. 198) is also defective owing to his mistaken notion that it deals with the definition of *vinai*. So he makes the addition '*poruṭpuṭai peyarcci pulappaṭup paṭuvē*' to Tol. Col. 198. Hence according to him *vinai* is that which denotes action and time and which does not take case-suffixes after it.

3.222. CLASSIFICATION: Verbs are primarily divided into two classes, viz., *kurippu-vinai* and *vinai*² (latterly known as *terinilai-vinai*).

1. It is worth noting that *vinai* in this sūtra alone evidently means *kṛti*. *Kṛti* is quite different from *kriyā*. *Kṛti* denotes the volitional effort of mind and *kriyā* denotes the activity that follows volition. All the commentators mistake the word *vinai* for *kriyā* or *tolil*, as may be seen, for example, from the statement of Cēṇāvaraiyar '*vaṇaintān enṇavaḷi, vaṇaitarrolilum, vaṇainta karuttāvuṁ, etc.*' and the repetition of the same by the author of Ilakkaṇa-viḷakkam (I. V. 226, Comm.). According to their interpretation the meaning of the sūtra becomes, *vinai* or *tolil* etc., precedes *tolil*. How can *tolil* precede *tolil*? It may be noted here that the same word *vinai* is used in other places to denote verb and the word *tolil* also is used in the same sense.

Cf. *Peyarun tolilum pirintoruṇ k-icaippa...* (Tol. E. 133.)

2. *Kurippinū vinaiyinu neri-p-paṭa-t- tonri-k*
Kālamotu varūṁ vinai-c-col l-ellām

3.2221. *KURIPPUVINAI* or appellative verbs are in the opinion of Tolkāppiyāṇār, those that are formed from the words denoting qualities as *ārralēṇ* (I possess strength) (Pattu. 346. 29), from compounds made up of a word denoting quality and a word denoting any limb as *netuñceviyan*, (he has sharp ears) from words made up of a noun and a particle denoting comparison as *ṇonṇannannam* (we are like gold in colour). (P. N. 84.2.), and the verbs *inru*, *ila*, *utaiya*, *anru*, *utaittu*, *alla* and *ula*,¹ the forms like *kuntukattū*, etc., and *illai* and *vēru*² which are common to all genders and numbers.

The author of *Vīracōliyam* seems to mention in V.K. 11 that *vinai* corresponds to the *bhāvēprayōga* in Sanskrit. Since the *bhāvēprayōga* in Sanskrit is used only in the third person singular to denote the action alone as *sthīyatē* for *sthiti* and the *vinai* is used in both the numbers of all the persons and denotes not only the action but also the person and the number, his view does not seem to be correct.

Nāṇūlār adds to the list of appellative verbs given by Tolkāppiyāṇār the words formed from those denoting the time and place as *ōṇattāṇ*, *kāṇakanātāṇai* (P.N. 5.3.) and the word *uṇṭū*, and says that *uṇṭū* is common to all genders and numbers³. He also defines *kurippuvina* as that which can take only a

Uyartina-k *k-urimaiyu m-a* : *rina*-k *k-urimaiyum*
*Ā-y-iru tinai*kum-ō *r-anna v-urimaiyum*
A-m-mū v-urupina tōṇra l-ārē. (Tol. Col. 201.)

1. *Inrila v-utaiya v-enṇuṇ* *kilaviyum*
Anrutait- talla v-enṇuṇ *kilaviyum*
Paṇpu-kol *kilaviyu m-ula-v-en* *kilaviyum*
Paṇpi n-ākiya cinai-mutar *kilaviyum*
Oppotu varūṇ *kilaviyotu tokai*
Appār pattuṇ *kurippotu kollum*. (ibid. 220.)
2. *Munṇilai viyaṅkōl* *vinai-y-eṇcu* *kilavi*
Inmai ceppal vēren *kilavi*
Ceymmaṇa ceyyūṇ ceyta v-enṇum
A-m-murai ninra v-ā-y-en *kilaviyum*
Tiripu-vēru patūṇ *ceytiya v-āki*
Irutina-c *cor*kumō *r-anna v-urimaiya*. (ibid. 222.)
3. *Vēṇillai y-uṇṭaim pāl-mū v-iṭattāṇa*. (Na. 339.)
Evaṇ-en *vināvinai-k* *kurippu ili y-iru-pāl*. (ibid. 350.)

subject before it and is not governed by any word in the second, the third, the fourth, the fifth or the seventh, case¹.

The author of *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* and other grammarians except the author of *Pirayōkavivēkam* have followed the author of *Naṇṇūl*.

It seems to me that the form *uṇṭū*² (from the root *u*!) which may have been used only as the neuter singular like *inṇū* and *anṇū* at the time of *Tolkāppiyaṇār* was generalised throughout so that it began to be used with all persons, genders and numbers from about the time of *Naṇṇūlār*.

The author of *Pirayōkavivēkam* seems to think that the *kuṛip̄puvinai* which are formed from nouns correspond to the *nāmadhātus* (denominatives) found in Sanskrit. For instance, the Tamil appellative verbs, *pāmpaṇaiyān*, *aṇṇip̄pān* are similar in nature to the *nāmadhātus* *puttrīyati*, *kṛṣṇāyatē*, etc. But it seems to me that they (*kuṛip̄puvinai*) are not so, though both are derived from nouns; for, *puttrīyati* means either he wishes to have a son or he wants to act like a son; similarly, *tapasyati* means he wishes to perform penance; *mālāti* means it acts like a garland and so on; but *maṇṇēn* in Tamil (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 722, 7), means 'I am the son'. Hence there is a great difference in sense, between *nāmadhātus* in Sanskrit and appellative verbs in Tamil. Besides there is a difference in the form too. Generally, one of the particles *kyac*, *kyañ* etc. is added between the noun and the verbal terminations in Sanskrit denominatives, and such verbs are used in all tenses and moods. But in Tamil appellatives, the verbal termination is invariably added directly to the nouns and they have no tense-element in their forms.

Hence I may say that the appellative verbs form a special feature of the Tamil Language. Originally, they may have been participial nouns and later on used as logical predicates. Afterwards, they may have been included under verbs.

3.2222. *VIṆAI OR TERINILAI VIṆAI* : 3.22221. *CLASSIFICATION INTO SIMPLE AND CAUSAL VERBS* : *Terinilaivina*i may be divided under two heads—*taṇ-vina*i or simple verb and *piṇa-vina*i or causal verb. It should be clearly understood here that *taṇ-vina*i and *piṇa-vina*i do not at all correspond to

1. *Porul-muta l-āriṇum tōrri-mun n-āraṇu!*

Viṇai-mutal māttirai viḷakkal viṇai-k-kuṛippe. (ibid. 321.)

2. cf. *Iṭai-p-paṭir kuṛuku m-iṭaṇu mār-uṇṭe.* (Tol. E. 37.)

ātmanēpada and *parasmaipada* respectively as stated by Dr. Caldwell.¹ For, *tan-vinai* denotes an action done by the person or thing denoted by its subject, while *ṭira-vinai* denotes an action done by one other than the agent denoted by the subject. But in Sanskrit if a root can take both *ātmanēpada* and *parasmaipada* terminations, the former are used when the result of the action goes to the doer and the latter when it goes to some one other than the doer.

Tan-vinai is transitive (*ceya-ṭ-ṭaṭu-ṭoruḷ-kunṛāvinai*) or intransitive (*ceya-ṭ-ṭaṭu-ṭoruḷ-kunṛiya-vinai*) according as it takes an object after it or not. In the sentence '*vaṛumai nōkkinṛū*' (noted the poverty) (P.N. 141.15.) *nōkkinṛū* is transitive since *vaṛumai* (the accusative sign 'ai' is elided here) is its object, and in the sentence '*cellāmōtil cilvaḷai viṛali*' (oh *viṛali* with a few bracelets, shall we go?) (P.N. 64.2.), *cellāmō* is intransitive. Hence Dr. Caldwell's statement that the *tan-vinai*.....are all necessarily as well as formally, intransitives² is not accurate.

The terms *tan-vinai* and *ṭira-vinai* are suggested by Tol-kāppiyanār by the words *tanṭālānum* and *ṭiraṇṭālānum* respectively in the sūtra

Itu-ceyal vēṇṭu m-enṇuṇ kiḷavi

Iru-vayi ṇilai-y-um ṭoruṭṭ-ā kummē

Tan-ṭā l-ānum ṭiraṇ-ṭā l-ānum. (Tol. Col. 243).

Peruntēvaṇār, the commentator on Vīracōḷiyam respectively calls them *kēvalatātu* and *kāritatātu*³, while the author of Nannūḷ uses the term *ēvalvinai* for *ṭiravinai*⁴, perhaps not liking the Sanskritic denomination *kāritatātu*.

The statement of Dr. Caldwell that 'these verbs (causals) have been classed with transitives both by the native grammarians and by Europeans, and Beschi alone places them in a class by themselves and calls them *ēvalvinai*'⁵ is therefore incorrect.

1. C. D. G. 449.

2. *Ibid.* 450.

3. *Āṭināṇ kēvala-t-tātu; āṭṭināṇ kārita-t-tātu.* (V. Tāt. 6, Comm.)

4. *Cey-y-eṇ vinai-vali vi-ṭ-ṭi tan-i-varin*

Ceyvi-y-eṇ ṇ-ēva l-inai-y-i ṇ-irēval. (Na. 138.)

5. C. D. G. 455.

3.222211. *HOW ARE CAUSAL VERBS FORMED?*
Tolkāppiyānār has not stated how causal verbs are formed. But in the literature of the Saṅgam period, the following forms of causals are found :—

Examples :	Quotations :
1. <i>uyarkkuvai</i>	<i>naṭṭavar-kuṭi-y-uyarkkuvai</i> (Pattu. 217. 131) (You will raise the fallen families).
2. <i>ṭeyarkkuvai</i>	<i>ceṛṛavar aracu ṭeyarkkuvai</i> (Pattu. 217. 132) (You will displace the sovereignty of the enemies).
3. <i>ṭōkki</i>	<i>kaivēl kaḷiṛroṭu ṭōkki</i> (K. 774) (Having sent the hand-trident with elephants).
4. <i>tolaicci</i>	<i>kaṭikāvinilai tolaicci</i> (Pattu. 218.153) (Having spoiled the guarded state of forests).
5. <i>kalip̄pi</i>	<i>marrai yāmam pakal ura-k-kalip̄pi</i> (Pattu. 236.653). (Having spent the remaining part of the day).
6. <i>tirutti</i>	<i>kōl tirutti</i> (P.N. 17.5) (Having reformed the scepture [rule]).
7. <i>cērtti</i>	<i>ṭarṛuvali-c-cērtti</i> (Cilap. 337.108). (Having attuned it to a song called <i>ṭarṛu</i>).
8. <i>uruṭṭi</i>	<i>āli-tiṛaṭṭa-v-uruṭṭi</i> (M. M. 61.76) (Having rolled the wheel so that it may become firm).
9. <i>ōṭṭi</i>	<i>alittōṭṭi</i> (Ep. I. Vol. XVII, Part VII. V. G. 95) (Having driven after routing them).
10. <i>vāl̄tti</i>	<i>atan tāl̄ vāl̄tti</i> (Pattu. 220.222) Having praised its feet).

From these it is seen that causals are formed from *tan-vinai* (1) by the doubling of the consonant of the formative as in examples 1 to 5 noted above, (2) by the doubling of the initial consonant of the signs of tense as in examples 6 and 7, (3) by the doubling of the final consonant of the root as in examples 8 and 9 or (4) by adding the particle 'ttu' to the root as in example 10.

In addition to such forms, the following forms are found in a few instances in Kural and in large numbers in the literature

written after the 5th century A.D. and in inscriptions of the same period.

<i>uḷappikkum</i>	<i>uḷappikkuñ cūti</i> (K. 938).	
<i>nayaḷpittār</i>	<i>nayaḷpittār nalkāmai</i> (K. 1190).	
<i>āṭṭuvittāl</i>	<i>āṭṭuvittālār oruvar āṭātārē</i> (T. 1229. stanza. 3).	
<i>aṭakkuvittāl</i>	<i>aṭakkuvittālār oruvar aṭaṅkātārē</i>	Do.
<i>ōṭṭuvittāl</i>	<i>ōṭṭuvittālār oruvar ōṭātārē</i>	Do.
<i>urukuvittāl</i>	<i>urukuvittālār oruvar urukātārē</i>	Do.
<i>ḷāṭṭuvittāl</i>	<i>ḷāṭṭuvittālār oruvar ḷāṭātārē</i>	Do.
<i>ḷaṇivittāl</i>	<i>ḷaṇivittālār oruvar ḷaṇiyātārē</i> (T. 1229.3).	
<i>kāṭṭuvittāl</i>	<i>kāṭṭuvittālār oruvar kāṇātārē</i>	Do.
<i>ceyvittāṇ</i>	<i>tāmra śāsanañ-jeyvittāṇ</i> (I.A. Vol. 22, p. 71 M.M.P.).	
<i>murruvikka</i>	<i>vēḷvi murruvikka</i> (Ep. I. Vol. XVII. Part VII. V.G. 36).	

aruḷḷippānai kattaruḷḷippānai (T. 17.4).

Here two points may be noted :—(1) In words like *ḷaṇivittāl*, *ceyvittāṇ*, *aruḷḷippānai*, *vi* or *ḷi* is added direct to the root and (2) in words like *ōṭṭuvittāl*, *āṭṭuvittāl*, etc., *vi* is added to the causal forms *ōṭṭu*, *āṭṭu*, etc., of the roots *ōṭu*, *āṭu*, etc. Hence *ōṭṭuvittāl* *āṭṭuvittāl*, etc., may be considered as double causals. Perhaps, seeing such examples, the author of *Vīracōḷiyam* said in V. Tāt. 6 that the forms like *āṭṭu*, *ārru*, are *kāritam* or causals and if *vi* or *ḷi* is added once after them, they become *kāritak-kāritam* or double causals and if *vi* or *ḷi* is added twice after them as *āṭṭuviḷḷāṇ*, they become *kāritakkāritakkāritam* or triple causals. But he has failed to note that *vi* or *ḷi* may be added direct to roots to make them causals even though examples like *uḷappikkum* and *ceyvittāṇ* were found before him.

Possibly to remove this defect *Nannūlār* says that *ēval* or causals are made by adding *vi* or *ḷi* to the root and *īrēval* or double causals, by adding either of them twice or both once¹, and does not mention triple causals.

The author of *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam*, though he agrees with *Nannūlār* that *ēval* or causals are formed by adding *vi* or *ḷi* to the root², feels that the mention of *īrēval* is absolutely

1. *Cey-y-en vinai-vaḷi vi-ḷi tani-varin*
Ceyvi-y-en n-ēva l-inai-y-i n-īr-ēval. (Na. 138.)
2. *Munna r-ōtiya mutanilai y-irutiya*
Vi-ḷi y-enpavar roppatu tani-varin
ēval vinai-mutar rerinilai vinaiyin
Mēvaru pakuti yām-ēna molipa. (I. V. 44.)

unnecessary¹.

The author of Pirayōkavivēkam prefers the Sanskritic term *kāritam* to denote *ēval* like the author of Vīracōliyam and mentions, in P.V. 35, that causals are formed by adding *vi* or *pi*, and, in the commentary on the same sūtra, says that they are also formed by the doubling of the consonant of the formative. In the same place he imports the Sanskritic grammatical term *ñijanta* and composes a small sūtra '*viṇṇi ñicantañ kāritam ākum*'. He calls the forms *āṭṭu*, *ūṭṭu*, etc. '*sahaja-ñijanta*'. When the ordinary form like *eṭutta* is used for the casual form *eṭupṇitta*, as in '*aracañ eṭutta-v-ālayam*', he says it is a case of '*antarbhāvitāṇic*'.

From this it is evident that the ordinary forms of verbs are also used in causal sense. The word '*taṇu*' mentioned by Iḷampūraṇar under Tol. E. 76 which means 'die or make another die' is a fitting example of this.

The introduction of the terms *ñijanta* and *antarbhāvitāṇic* by the author of Pirayōkavivēkam in Tamil grammar does not seem to be appropriate, since the term *ñic* denotes the causal pratyaya *i* in Sanskrit, while the causal elements in Tamil are of varied nature.

In this connection, it may be mentioned that, in the indeclinable participial forms like *kolīi*, *niṇīi*, where the roots are *kol* and *nil*, the element *īi* is considered by the present day Tamil Pandits to be the elongated *ī* and to convey the causal sense. In order to determine whether it is exactly so, I give below a brief analysis of all the indeclinable participial forms found in Puraṇānūṟu and Pattuppāṭṭu.

Root.	Indeclinable participial form in which it appears.	No. of times in Pura-nānūṟu.	No. of times in Pattu-p-pāṭṭu.
(a) <i>ari</i>	<i>arīi</i> (causal)	...	1
<i>aṇi</i>	<i>aṇīi</i> (simple)	1	...
<i>kalī</i>	<i>kalīi</i> do.	...	1
<i>kulī</i>	<i>kulīi</i> do.	2	7
<i>talī</i>	<i>talīi</i> do.	9	10
	(causal)	...	2
	(passive sense)	...	1

1. *Irukāl-ēvutal kūṟiyatu kūṟal-ām-ākaliṇ*.... (I. V. 44, Comm.)

	Root. Indeclinable participial form in which it appears.	No. of times in Pura- nānūrū.	No. of times in Pattu-p- pāṭṭi.
	<i>paṭi</i> <i>paṭīi</i> (causal)	1	...
	<i>muṭi</i> <i>muṭīi</i> (simple)	3	2
	(noun)		
	<i>muri</i> <i>murīi</i> do.	1	...
(b)	<i>iru</i> <i>irīi</i> (simple)	...	1
	(causal)	2	5
	<i>uṭu</i> <i>uṭīi</i> (simple)	...	3
	(causal)	...	2
	<i>uru</i> <i>urīi</i> (simple)	...	2
	(causal)	...	1
	<i>uru</i> <i>urīi</i> do.	1	...
	<i>oru</i> <i>orīi</i> (simple)	4	1
	<i>kelu</i> <i>kelīi</i> do.	1	4
	(causal)	...	1
	<i>ceruku</i> <i>cerīi</i> (simple)	1	1
	<i>taru</i> <i>tarīi</i> do.	...	5
	<i>maru(vu)</i> <i>marīi</i> do.	...	1
	<i>veru(vu)</i> <i>verīi</i> do.	...	5
	<i>poru(vu)</i> <i>porīi</i> do.	...	1
(c)	<i>acai</i> <i>acaii</i> do.	2	10
	<i>aḷai</i> <i>aḷaii</i> do.	...	4
	(passive sense)	...	1
	<i>urai</i> <i>uraii</i> (simple)	...	1
	<i>kaṭai</i> <i>kaṭaii</i> do.	...	2
	<i>kavai</i> <i>kavaii</i> do.	...	2
	(causal)	...	1
	<i>kuvai</i> <i>kuvaii</i> do.	...	3
	<i>kai</i> <i>kaii</i> (simple)	...	1
	<i>taṭai</i> <i>taṭaii</i> do.	...	1
	<i>tulai</i> <i>tulaii</i> (causal)	...	1
	<i>tai</i> <i>taii</i> (simple)	1	1
	<i>nacai</i> <i>nacaii</i> do.	1	3
	<i>nirai</i> <i>niraii</i> (causal)	..	1
	<i>nilai</i> <i>nilaii</i> (simple)	...	1
	<i>ninai</i> <i>ninaii</i> do.	...	1
	<i>munai</i> <i>munaii</i> do.	2	2
	<i>vaḷai</i> <i>vaḷaii</i> (simple)	1	2
	(causal)	1	6
	(passive sense)	1	...

Root. Indeclinable participial form in which it appears.			No. of times in Pura-nānūru.	No. of times in Pattu-p-pāṭṭu.
<i>virai</i>	<i>viraii</i>	(simple)	2	4
		(causal)	...	1
(d) <i>koḷ</i>	<i>koḷi</i>	do.	8	7
<i>niḷ</i>	<i>niṟi</i>	do.	2	3

This list shows that *aḷapeṭai* is found in the indeclinable participles of roots ending in the vowels *i*, *u* and *ai* and in the consonants *l* and *ḷ*. It seems to me that it may occur even in roots ending in consonants other than *l* and *ḷ* since the form *uṇṇi* (meaning *uṇṇu*) is found in *Aiṅkurunūru*. But of the roots ending in vowels only those that end in *i*, *u* or *ai* take it.

Besides, it is seen from the list that their usage as *tan-vinaḷ* or simple verbs to their usage as *piṟa-vinaḷ* or causal verbs is roughly in the ratio of 2 : 1. Since the active form itself is capable of giving passive sense in Tamil, we need not discuss the cases where the passive sense is conveyed in some of the examples noted above.

In the examples under (c) and (a), we should carefully consider whether the final *i* is the element showing the elongation of the previous *ai* or *ī*, or is a separate element by itself. My opinion is that it is the latter; and it is the element that is added to roots to form indeclinable participles as it is in the forms *uraṅki*, *pāṭi*, etc. Thus, in the forms of the roots ending in *ai* as *acaii*, *ai* is the final element of the root, and *i*, the sign of the indeclinable participle. If that be so, one may ask, whether it is not necessary to have the intervocalic *y* between *ai* and *i*. The sūtra:

Ellā molikku m-uyir-varu valiyē

Uṭam-paṭu mey-y-i ṇ-uruvu-koḷal varaiyār.

(Tol. E. 141.)

clearly says that the insertion of the intervocalic element is only optional. Then what is the element in such cases that makes them causal? It is the context that makes the ordinary forms of verbs convey a causal sense.

The forms *koḷi*, *niṟi* of the roots ending in consonants mentioned under head (d) may have been formed thus:—*koḷ* (root) + *ī* (auxiliary verb, meaning to give) + *i* (sign of the indeclinable participle) and *niḷ* + *ī* + *i*. Here the root *ī* is added as an auxiliary to give causal sense. Thus *koṇṇu* means 'having taken' and *koḷi* means 'having given to take' i.e. having allowed

another to take. The cases where the root *ī* is used as an auxiliary are largely found in works of Sangam period, especially in Kalittokai. (e. g. *vantīṅku collukuttīvāyē* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 420.19.): *pākaṇ vantīyāṇ kol.* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 429.10.) In these two examples, *collukuttīvāyē* and *vantīyāṇ* only mean *colluvāyē* and *vantāṇ* respectively. Though *ī* generally gives causal sense, yet here it does not denote it like the *ṇic* in the root forms *cōrayati*, etc. of the 10th conjugation in Sanskrit. That such usage is common is seen from the statement in P. V. 35 Comm. that the word *tērrātavar* in the sentence '*naṭpāṭarērrātavar*' means only *tērātavar* and hence *tērrātavar* is a *kārita* denoting 'svārtha.'

In this context it may be seen that other roots also like *taru* *varu* are largely used as auxiliaries without any special sense. (e.g.).....*tiritaru*.....(Pattu. 1.1) *citaitara* (Pari. 76.48.): *tuyal-varūm* (Pattu. 7.86). Besides both *ī* and *taru* are used as auxiliaries in the same word. (e. g.) *iṅku vantittantāy* (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 583.4).

Then as regards *ī* in the forms *arīi*, *irīi*, etc. derived from the roots ending in *i* and *u* mentioned under (a) and (b), I may say that the auxiliary *ī* was added to them, when their final vowel disappeared.¹ In the later periods the forms *kalīi*, *uṭīi*, etc., have given place to *kalittu*, *uṭuttu*, etc. (e.g.) *kalittar karumai-yāl* (N. 56.): *tukilum uṭuttu* (N. 264), and *urīi*, etc. to *uruvi*, etc. so that the root is now considered as *uruvu*, etc.

Again the forms with *vi* or *pi* are not found, as far as I see, in the Sangam works earlier than Kuṛaḷ. What could have been the reason for the introduction of *vi* or *pi*? *Pi* and *vi* in such examples as *kalippi* (Pattu. 236,653.) and *koḷuvi* (Pattu. 353,324) where *p* and *v* are intervocalics may have been mistaken to be similar to *pi* and *vi* in the Sanskrit forms *dāpitaḥ*, *māpitaḥ*, *sphāvitaḥ* even though *p* or *v* is considered in Sanskrit not as a causal suffix, but the element added before the causal suffix *i*, and then such forms as *kurāivittu* (T. 2.81.), etc. may have been used.

1. This point suggested itself to me in the following circumstances:—The addition of syllables to increase the quantity is allowed by Tolkāppiyaṇār in verse and also in the use of vocatives. He has nowhere said that it is used to give the sense of indeclinable participle. The insertion of intervocalic *y*, *v* etc. is, according to him, optional. The roots *taru*, *varu* and *ī* are found in large numbers as auxiliaries in the literature of the Sangam

In colloquial Tamil, words like *pāṭa-c-ceytēn* and *kaṭṭa-ṭ-panṇinēn* are used instead of *pāṭuvittēn* and *kaṭṭuvittēn*.

The formation of double and triple causals is a peculiar development in Tamil. It is not seen in Sanskrit.

3.22222. *MOODS, VOICES AND TENSES*: *Terinilai-vinai* has four moods, indicative, *ēval* or imperative, *viyaṅkōl* or optative and *eccam* or infinitive, and two voices—active affirmative and active negative—in the ancient period, and four voices—active affirmative, active negative, passive affirmative and passive negative—in the medieval and modern periods. There are three tenses in the indicative and infinitive moods, while there is only one in the imperative and the optative moods.

3.222221. *INDICATIVE MOOD* : 3.2222211 *ACTIVE AFFIRMATIVE VOICE*: The verbs in the indicative mood of the active affirmative voice denote three points;—*action*, *time* and *person*. The element denoting action is evidently the root like *pō*, *nil*, etc.; the element denoting person is the verbal termination, *aṇ*, *āṇ*, etc., which will shortly be dealt with in detail; the element denoting time is not mentioned by *Tolkāp-piyanār*; but the fact that he recognises such an element is seen from his statement that the past tense is sometimes used for the future and so on.¹ The later grammarians like the authors of *Vīracōliyam*, *Nannūl*, etc. make mention of them. What they are will be indicated after a detailed examination of personal terminations.

3.22222111. *PERSONAL TERMINATIONS (ANCIENT PERIOD)*.

	Singular:	Plural:
1st person	<i>eṇ</i> , <i>ēṇ</i> , <i>al</i> , <i>kū</i> , <i>ṭū</i> , <i>tū</i> , <i>ṛū</i> ²	<i>aṇ</i> , <i>ām</i> , <i>eṇ</i> , <i>ēm</i> , <i>kum</i> , <i>ṭum</i> , <i>tum</i> , <i>rum</i> ³ .

period, and *i* is found as the sign of the indeclinable participles in *uraṅki*, *pāṭi* etc.

1. *Vārāk kālattu nikaluṇ kālattum*
Ōrāṅku varūum vinai-c-cor kilavi
Iranta kālattu-k kurip̄poṭu kilattal
Virainta poruḷa v-eṇmaṇār pulavar. (Tol Col. 241.)
2. *Ka-ṭa-ta-ra v-eṇnum*
A-n-nāṇ k-ūrnta kunriya lukaramoṭu
Eṇ-ṇ-ē ṇ-al-l-eṇa varūu m-ēḷun
Taṇ-vinai y-uraikkun taṇmai-c collē. (ibid. 203.)
3. *Avaitām*
Am-m-ā m-em-m-ē m-eṇṇuṇ kilaviyum
Um-m-oṭu varūuṇ ka-ṭa-ta-ra v-eṇnum

	Singular :	Plural :
2nd person	<i>i, ai, āy, ōy</i> ¹	<i>ir, īr</i> . ²
3rd person		
(a) masculine	<i>aṇ, āṇ, ōṇ</i> ³	<i>ar, ār, ōr, pa</i> and <i>mār</i> .
(b) feminine	<i>aḷ, āḷ, ōḷ</i>	epicene plural. ⁴ & ⁵
(c) neuter	<i>tu, lu, ru</i> ⁶	<i>a, ā, va</i> . neuter plural. ⁷
(MEDIEVAL & MODERN PERIODS.)		
1st person	<i>eṇ, ēṇ, aḷ, aṇ</i> <i>ku, tu, lu, ru</i> ⁸	<i>am, ām, em, ēm, eṇkal,</i> <i>ōm, kum, tum, tum, rum</i> . ⁹

- A-n-nār kilaviyo t-ā-y-eṇ kilaviyum*
Paṇmai y-uraikkun taṇmai-c collē. (ibid. 202.)
1. *Avarru!*
Munṇilai-k kilavi
I-ai āy-eṇa varūu mūṇrum
Oppa-t tōṇru m-oruvarkku m-onṇarṇkum. (ibid. 223.)
Āy-eṇ kilaviyu m-avarroṭu kollum. (ibid. 212.)
2. *Ir-ir miṇ-n-eṇa varūu mūṇrum*
Pallōr maruṇkinum palavarru maruṇkinuṇ
Collōr-aṇaiya v-eṇmaṇār pulavar. (ibid. 224.)
3. *An-ān aḷ-ā leṇṇu nāṇkum*
Oruvar maruṇkiṇ paṭarkkai-c collē. (ibid. 205.)
4. *Ar-ār pa-eṇa varūu mūṇrum*
Pallōr maruṇkiṇ paṭarkkai-c collē. (ibid. 206.)
Mārai-k kilavi-y-um pallōr paṭarkkai
Kāla-k kilaviyoṭu muṭiyu m-eṇpa. (ibid. 207.)
5. *Pāl-ari maraṇi n-am-mū v-irrum*
Ā-v-ō v-ākuṇ ceyyu l-uḷḷē. (ibid. 211.)
6. *Onṇan paṭarkkai ta-ra-ta v-ūrnta*
Kunṇiya lukara-t t-iruti y-ākum. (ibid. 217.)
7. *A-ā va-eṇa varūu m-iruti*
Appān mūṇrē palavarru-p paṭarkkai. (ibid. 216.)
8. *Tāy-āy-un-tir-iruṇ cārriya-tirkaḷ-o t-irkāl-um-āṇ*
Cāyāta munṇilai y-in-n-irappān-taṇmai taṇ-n-irappir
Rēyāta-tēn-ēn-un tēm-ēm-un-tōm-ōm-umu m-ākum-eṇpa
Vēyār-potiyat t-akattiyāṇār-conṇa mey-t-tamiḷkkē.
(V. K. 6.)
- Kirāay-ninrāy-kirir ninrīr-kirīrkal-ninrīrkal-um-āy*
Irā-ninraṇa-munṇilai-y-in-nikalcci y-itan-kaṭṭaṇmai
Kirē eṇ-ninrēn-kirē (m) ninrōn-kirōm-u
ninrōm-um-eṇrān
Terā-ninra-kaṭ-pava laṇ-tikal-vāy-nar rirntilaiyē.
(ibid. 7.)

	Singular :	Plural :
2nd person	<i>i, ai, āy, ōy</i>	<i>ir, īr, īrkaḷ,</i>
3rd person		
(a) masculine	<i>aṇ, āṇ, ōṇ</i>	<i>ar, ār, ōr,</i> epicene
(b) feminine	<i>aḷ, āḷ, ōḷ</i>	<i>ārkaḷ, pa, mār.</i> plural.
(c) neuter	<i>tū, rū</i>	<i>a & ā.</i> neuter plural.
		(<i>ā</i> in the negative mood.)

Eṇ and *Ēṇ*: Of these two terminations, *eṇ* is more frequently used in the ancient period than *ēṇ*, and whenever it is used, it is preceded by a *cāriyai aṇ*. (e.g.) *kaṇṭaṇeṇ* (I found) (P. N. 23.17.): *vantaṇeṇ* (I came) (P. N. 158.20.): in the later

Vāy-pāy-vīr-pīr-vīrkaḷ pīrkaḷ-ivai-maṇṇu munṇilaiyir
Cāypāyviṭum-etir kālam-itaṇuḷi-t taṇmaicollin
Vēy-pāviya-toḷi vēṇ-pēṇ-vēm pēmoṭu vōm-pōm-um-āṇ
Cey-pāviya-celum pōti-p-pīrān-raṇ rirunturaikkē. (ibid.8.)
Ku-tu-tu-rū enṇuṇ kurriya lukaramōṭu
Al-aṇ eṇ-ēṇ āku m-īrra
Iru-tiṇai mu-k-kūr r-orumait-t taṇmai. (Na. 331.)
Am-ām eṇpaṇa munṇilai y-ārai-yum
Em-ēm ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-ārai-yum
Um-ūr ka-ṭa-ta-ra iru-pā l-ārai-yum
Tannoṭu paṭukkun taṇmai-p paṇmai. (ibid. 332.)
Ai-āy ikara v-īrra mūṇrum
Evalin varū m-ellā v-īrravum
Muppā l-orumai munṇilai moliyē. (ibid. 335.)
Ir-īr īrra iraṇṭu m-iru-tiṇai-p
Paṇmai munṇilai miṇ-avar r-ēval. (ibid. 337.)
Ku-tu-tu-rū v-enṇuṇ kunriya lukaramo
Tal-l-aṇ n-eṇ-ē n-āku m-īrra
Iru-tiṇai mu-k-kūr r-orumai-t taṇmai-yum
Am-m-ā m-īrra munṇilai y-ārai-yum
Em-m-ē m-ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-ārai-yum
Um-m-ūr ka-ṭa-ta-ra v-iru-pā l-ārai-yum
Tannoṭu paṭukkun taṇmai-p paṇmai-yum. (I. V. 237.)
Ai-y-ā y-ikara vīrra mūṇru
Mēvalin varū m-ellā v-īrrō
T-al-lā l-ēl-kā n-enṇu m-īrravum
Muppā l-orumai munṇilai viṇaiyum
Ir-ī r-īrra v-iraṇṭu m-irutiṇai-p
Paṇmai munṇilai-y-u miṇṇu m-īrra
Anṇavar r-ēvalu m-ām-ēna molipa. (ibid. 238.)
Tāṇ-āṇ-un-tāl-āl-un tār-ārun-tārkaḷ-o ṭ-ārkaḷ-enru
Meṇām-uraitta pirattiyam-ākun tātu-v-atu-v-un

period *ēn* is more frequently used. (e.g.) *ukantēn nān* (I praised) (P. T. 169.4): *ninnatāintēn nān* (I went to you) (P. T. 169.5). These two are used in all tenses. *En* is used even without the *cāriyai*. (e.g.) *kāppen* (I will protect) (Kampar. A. 232.28).

AL: The commentator on *Vīracōliyam* says that *al* is used to denote the determination of the speaker.¹ *Cēnāvaraiyar* says in his commentary on the *sūtra*

Ka-ta-ta-ra v-ennum
A-n-nān k-ūrnta-kurriya l-ukaramōṭu
En-n-ē n-al-l-ena varūn m-ēlum
Tan-vinai y-uraikkum tanmai-c-collē. (Tol. Col. 203.)

Tēn-ār-kulali tana-v-um-ana-v-un tikaḷ-paṭarkkai
Ānā-v-irappir roḷirpatam-ārirkku m-āyula-riyē. (V. K. 3.)
Ninrān kirān-oṭu ninrāl-kirāl-ivai ninrār-kirār
Ninrārkaḷ-oṭu-kin rārkaḷu-ninratuṇi kinratu-v-un
Tenrāta-cir-nin rana-kinrana-v-un tikaḷ-paṭarkkai-p
Pinrānikalkai toḷir-patam-ārirkum pērttariyē. (ibid. 4.)
Vān-pān-um-vāl-pāl-um vār-pār-um-vār kaḷ-um

pārkaḷ-uñ-cir

Tān-pāviya-v-atu v-um-patu-v-un-tattai y-attai-v-enra
Tēn-pāvuñ-colli vana-v-um-pana-v-un tikaḷ-paṭarkkai
Vān-pān-maliyu m-etirvir-roḷirpata m-ārirkumē. (ibid. 5.)
An-ā niru-moli ānpār paṭarkkai. (Na. 325.)
Al-ā l-iru-moli penpār paṭarkkai. (ibid. 326.)
Ar-ār pa-v-v-ū r-akara mā r-irra
Pallōr paṭarkkai mār vinai-y-oṭu muṭimē. (ibid. 327.)
Tu-ru-tu-k kurriya lukara v-irra
Onran paṭarkkai tu-k kurippi n-ākum. (ibid. 328.)
Aā v-irra palavin paṭarkkai
Ā-v-ē etirmaraiḱ kaṇṇa t-ākum. (ibid. 329.)
An-n-ā n-iru-moli y-ānpār paṭarkkaiyum
Al-l-ā l-iru-moli penpār paṭarkkaiyum
Ar-ār pa-v-v-ū r-akāra mārirra
Pallōr paṭarkkaiyum pakaru-man n-avarun
Mārai-k kiḷavi vinaiyoṭu muṭiyinum
Mēlaiḱ kiḷaviyoṭu vērupā tinrē. (I. V. 232.)
Tu-ru-tu-k kurriya lukara v-irra
Onran paṭarkkaiyum a-ā v-irra
Palavin paṭarkkaiyum pakaruman n-avan-ut
Tu-v-v-iru kiḷavi kurippir k-ērralum
Ā-v-i r-etirmarai-k k-ākalu m-uriya. (ibid. 234.)

1. *Tuṇivu-p-porulṇ-kaṇ tanmai-y-orumaiyil vaṇ, paṇ ennum iranṭu pirattiyum-ām.* (V. K. 10, Comm.)

that *al* is preceded by *ḥ* or *v* and is used only in verbs denoting the future tense. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar adds in his commentary on the same sūtra that it is sometimes used in the verbs denoting present tense also as in the word *uṇṇā-niṇṇal* (I eat). The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Cēṇāvaraiyar.¹ In the literature of the Sangam period, though *al* is generally used in verbs denoting future tense, yet there are instances where it is found in verbs denoting past tense also. (e.g.) *kaṇṭaṇṇu varuval* (I came to see) (P. N. 23.17) and *uvakaiyoṭṭi varuval* (I came eagerly) (P. N. 165.14). But in all the instances, the *determination of the speaker* is implied. Hence the opinion of the commentator of Vīracōḷiyam seems to me to be more satisfactory. This may perhaps be the reason why Tolkāppiyaṇār has not mentioned the element that denotes tense signs and the particular terminations that are used after them.

AN : This is not mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṇār as a termination of the first person singular. But there are instances in Purāṇānūṟu '*uraittaṇaṇ yāṇ*' (I said) (P. N. 136.22.) *yāṇum... vantaṇaṇ* (even I came) (P. N. 154.7.) where *aṇ* is so used. Similar examples are found in later literature also. (e.g.) *ceykuvaṇ tavam eṇa* (that I will do penance) (M. M. 50.182.). These examples may have induced the author of Vīracōḷiyam to state that *aṇ* along with *ḥ* or *v* as *ḥaṇ* or *vaṇ* is the first person singular termination.²

The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam says that *aṇ* is used in verbs denoting future tense.³ But the example *uraittaṇaṇ* cited above denotes only past tense. Hence the opinion of the author of Vīracōḷiyam seems to me to be more satisfactory.

WHAT MAY BE THE ORIGIN OF THIS AN ? This may be identical with *aṇ* of the third person singular masculine. Since there is sometimes a tendency to use third person to denote the speaker himself possibly out of modesty, this may have been originally used to denote first person in *sense* though, in *form*, it may have been taken as third person singular masculine, and afterwards the form itself may have been mistaken for that

1. *Uṇṇal, varuval eṇa varum al-l-irru-t . taṇmai-y-orumai-murru-c-collum... etirkālam-parri varum.* (I. V. 237, Comm.)

2. *Taṇmai-t-tuṇivā m-orumai-vaṇ-ḥaṇa...* (V. K. 10.)

3. *Kūruvaṇ eṇa varum aṇ-n-irru-t taṇmai-y-orumai-murru-c-collum etirkālam-parri-varum.* (I. V. 237, Comm.)

of the first person. Or the third personal termination *an* itself may have been used originally both for the third and the first person at the beginning of the formation of the language and these instances may be the survivals of such pre-historic usage; for, if we observe the growth of language in children, it is seen that it takes a long time for them to grasp the idea of 'I' and so they generally refer to themselves only in the third person. Or *al* mentioned above may have been metamorphosed into *an* as the case-suffies *ān* and *in* to *āl* and *il* respectively. cf. 3.213233 and 3.213234 *supra*.

Kū, Tū, Tū, Rū : Of these four *tū*, *tū* and *rū* belong not only to the first person singular, but also to the third person neuter. Wherever these are used, they are not preceded by the tense signs unlike the terminations *en*, *ēn*, etc. Hence it seems to me that these forms may have come into existence by cutting off *ēn*, *ān*, *ār*, etc. from *uṇṭēn*, *tantēn*, *cenrēn*, *uṇṭān*, *tantān*, *cenrān*, *uṇṭār*, *tantār*, *cenrār*, etc. as in Malayālam, since the meaning of *ēn*, *ān*, and *ār* are expressed by their subjects *yān* or *nān*, *avan* and *avar* respectively and may have been at some time used in all the persons and numbers, but later on restricted to the first person singular and the third person neuter singular. Similarly the form *uṇkū* may have been evolved out of *uṇkēn* and may have been restricted to the first person singular.

Iḷampūraṇar thinks that the forms *uṇkū*, *uṇṭū*, *vantū* and *cērū* (Tol. Col. 203, Iḷam.) are used only in the future tense. Naṇṇūlār says in Na. 145 that *rū* and *tū* denote the past and the future, *tū*, the past and *kū*, the future tense. Cēṇāvaraiyar agrees with Iḷampūraṇar. Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar states with caution that all the four *mostly* denote the future tense. The author of Iḷakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Iḷampūraṇar. (I. V. 50.)

Am, Ām, Em, Ēm, Ēṇkal, Ōm : Of these, the first four are generally used in all periods, while the fifth, which is evidently a double plural termination, in the medieval period and the last in the medieval and modern periods. *Ōm* may have sprung from *ām* by changing *ā* to *ō* through analogy with the formations *vantōn*, *vantōl*, *vantōr* and *vantōy*.

The following may serve as examples for most of the terminations mentioned above:—*uṇkuvam* (we will eat) (P. N. 136,26.): *ēttukam* (we will praise) (P. N. 161,32.): *kūrurām* (we will narrate) (Kampar. B. 26,1.): *uṭai-y-ēm* (we have) (P. N.

112,2): *uṇṭēṇkaḷ* (we ate) (C. C. 1795.): *tantōm* (we gave) *vēṇṭōm* (we do not pray for) (P. T. 195, 5).

These terminations are like *eṇ*, *ēṇ*, etc. preceded by the tense signs.

Ilampūraṇar, Cēṇāvaraiyar and Nacciṇārkkiniyar mention that *ām* and *ōm* are used when the subject denotes the speaker and the person spoken to, or the speaker, the person spoken to and a third person, and *em* and *ēm* when it denotes the speaker and a third party.¹ Naṇṇūlār says the same, but adds *ōm* also to the latter list.² The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Naṇṇūlār.³ The author of Vīracōḷiyam mentions only *ēm* and *ōm*. The following may serve as examples for the same :—

Payil pūntaṇṭalai-p-paṭarkuvam (Cilap. 258,67.); here *paṭarkuvam* means 'let her, you and me go'.

Ēval ceytuṇaiivarēm yāṇkaḷ (Kampar. K. 175.14.); here *ēval-ceytuṇaiivarēm* means 'let me and others serve you'.

Varikku-k-kūru ceyvārkaḷukkum conṇōm (S. I. I. iii, i, 44-5); here *conṇōm* does not include the person spoken to.

In colloquial speech of the modern days, only the terminations *ōm* and *ēṅga* or *ēṅgō*, the modified forms of *ēṇkaḷ* are used. *Ēṅga* or *ēṅgō* are used only by uneducated people. M. J. Vinson mentions only the latter form. (J. A. Dixie Serie Tome 17, p. 189.)

Kum, Tum, Tum, Rum: Whatever is said of *kū*, *tū*, *tū*, and *rū* applies to these four. Evidently, these are formed from *kū*, *tū*, *tū* and *rū* by the addition of the pluralising particle *m*; (e.g.) *kāraṇaṇ kūrutum* (we shall state the reasons) (T. 3.3).

I, ai, āy, ōy: Of these terminations, *i* and *ai* are more frequently used in the ancient period, while *āy* in the later periods; the form *ōy* is generally used in literature. In colloquial speech only the termination *āy* is now frequently used. (e.g.) *varaiti*

1. *Am ām eṇpaṇa munṇinrārai uḷappaṭukkum; tamar-āya-vaḷi paṭarkkai-y-ārai-y-um uḷappaṭukkum. Em ēm eṇpaṇa paṭarkkaiyārai uḷappaṭukkum.* (Tol. Col. 202, Cenā.)

2. *Am-ām eṇpaṇa munṇilai y-ārai-yum*
Em-ēm ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-ārai-yum. (Na. 332.)

3.
Am-m-ā mīrra munṇilai y-ārai-yum
Em-m-ē m-ōm-ivai paṭarkkai y-ārai-yum.... (I. V. 237.)

(you classify) (P. N. 8,8): *varuti* (you come) (P.N. 8.8.): *paṭiyinai* (you made them rest) (P.N. 15.10.): *eri ūṭṭinai* (you set fires) (P.N. 16,17.): *ollāy* (you will not desire) (P. N. 31.6.): *ūtāy* (you will blow) (P.T. 160.6 to 10.): *koṭuttōy* (you gave) (P.N. 2,16). [The author of *Vīracōliyam* mentions only *āy*.]

Ir, īr, īrkaḷ: *Ir* and *īr* are generally used in the literature of all periods. In the medieval and modern periods, the double plural terminations began to be used. (e. g.) *celkuvīr* (you will go) (Cilap. 295,91.): *paṭarīr* (you traverse) (Cilap. 295,87.): *vantīrkaḷ* (you have come) (colloq.) *ir* is practically extinct. [The author of *Vīracōliyam* mentions only *īr* and *īrkaḷ*.] In the colloquial speech at the present day, *īr* is used in the honorific singular alone and *īrkaḷ*, *īṅga* and *īṅgō* are used in honorific singular and plural. The forms *īṅga* and *īṅgō* are used only by uneducated people. They are evidently the modified forms of *īrkaḷ*. The substitution of *ṅ* for *r* may be due to the principle of economy of effort, since it is easier to pronounce *ṅ* before *g* than *r*; or it may be through analogy with *ṅ* in *vantēṅga* or *vantēṅgō*. The latter form is mentioned by M. J. Vinson. (J. A. Dixieme Series, Tome 17, p. 189.)

An, ān, ōn: *An* is generally preceded by the *cāriyai an* as *aṭṭanan* (he killed) (P.N. 78,12). But it is used by itself after the roots (*uḷ, il*, etc.) (e.g.) *uḷan* (he is) (P.N. 86,3). *Ōn* is used only in literature. (e.g.) *urantaiyōṇē* (he belongs to *urantai* (P.N. 68,18.) [The author of *Vīracōliyam* mentions only *ān*. (V.K. 3,4, etc.)] but the later grammarians follow *Tolkāppiyāṇār*. In colloquial Tamil only *ān* is used.

Al, āl, ōl: Whatever has been said about *an, ān* and *ōn* holds good for *al, āl*, and *ōl*. (e. g.) *alutanaḷ* (she bewailed) (P. N. 143.15). [The author of *Viracōliyam* mentions only *āl*] but the later grammarians follow *Tolkāppiyāṇār*.

Ar, ār, ōr, pa, mār, ārkaḷ: The first five are used in all periods, while the last is found only in the medieval and modern periods. *Ōr* is used only in literature. *Ārkaḷ* is evidently a double plural termination. As regards *mār*, I quite agree with M. J. Vinson that it is also a case of double plural termination. (J. A. Dixieme Serie Tome, 17, p. 189.) Verbal forms with *ārkaḷ* are very frequently used in *Tēvāram* and *Nālāyirappirapantam*. (e.g.) *pukaḷvārkaḷ* (they will praise) (T. 32,9). Hence it seems to be that the author of *Vīracōliyam*

has mentioned *ārkaḷ* side by side with *ār*. But it is difficult to understand why he has not mentioned the terminations *ar*, *ōr*, *pa* and *mār*. The other grammarians have followed Tolkāppiyaṇār. In the colloquial speech of the present day, the termination *ār* is used in honorific singular and *ārkaḷ* both in honorific singular and plural. Uneducated people use *āṅga* and *āṅgō*, the modified forms of *ārkaḷ*. They may have had the same origin as *iṅga* or *iṅgō*.

Tū, *rū*: Naṇṇūlār states that *tū* and *rū* denote the past and the future tense.¹ Cēṇāvaraiyar's opinion is that *tū* is used after the sign of all the three tenses, and *rū* after that of the past.² Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar agrees with the latter.³ [*Tū* is not included here since Cēṇāvaraiyar and Nacciṇārkkīṇiyar think that it is used only in the appellative verbs.]

A, *ā*, *va*: Whenever *a* is used, it is generally preceded by the cāriyai *aṇ*. (e. g.) *paraintaṇa* (they have been scraped, (P.N. 4.3); *maruṇṇu-ṇ-ṇōṇṇaṇa* (they are like horns (P.N. 4,4.); but there are examples where it is used without it. (e. g.) *tōṇṇuva* (they will appear) (P. N. 4.5). *Ā* is used in the negative sense. Tolkāppiyaṇār himself has used it so. (e.g.) *uyirmey allana molimuta lākā* (Tol. E. 60); but he has not expressly stated in any of his sūtras that it has negative sense. Naṇṇūlār, seems to be the first grammarian to mention it,⁴ and the author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam follows him.⁵

[The author of Vīracōliyam mentions *aṇa* which evidently shows that he takes the termination and the cāriyai *aṇ* together as termination. He does not mention *ā* or *va*.]

A NOTE ON *KAL* in *ENKAL*, *ĪRKAL*, *ĀRKAL* : According to Tolkāppiyaṇār, *kaḷ* is optionally used as the pluralising

1. Ra-v-v-o ṭu-kara v-ummai-nikaḷ p-allavum
Ta-v--o ṭ-irappu m-etirvum.... (Na. 145.)
2. Takara-v-ukaram mūṇṇu-kālattirṭkum urittū;
Rakara-v-ukaram iṇanta-kālattirṭku urittū.
(Tol. Col. 217, Cēṇā.)
3. *Ibid.* (Tol. Col. 217, Nac.)
4. *Aā irra palavin paṭarkkai*
Ā-v-ē etir-marai-k kaṇṇa tākum. (Na. 329.)
5. *Turu-tu-k kurriya lukara v-irra*
Onṇaṇ paṭarkkaiyum a-ā v-irra
Ā-v-ī ṭ-etir-marai-k k-ākalu m-uriya. (T. V. 234.)

particle of *aṣṛiṇai* nouns. Its use may have subsequently been extended to *uyartiṇai* nouns also. (e.g.) *maṇitarkaḷ* (men). In such cases it is added mostly to plural forms, thus making them double plurals. Verbal forms like *pōṇār* may be used as nouns also in Tamil in the sense of persons who went, and declined as *pōṇārai*, *pōṇāroṭṭi*, etc. To the latter type of forms like *pōṇār*, *kaḷ* may have been added and thus forms like *pōṇārkaḷ* may have come into being, in the sense of persons who went. (e.g.) *col-mālai colluvārkaḷ...neṭuṇkālam vālvārē* (those who compose songs will live for a long time) (P. T. 135. 10); here *colluvārkaḷ* means those who will say. Such forms were, perhaps, through confusion, treated as verbs. From such instances, *kaḷ* should have become generalised as a pluralising particle in verbs also. Thus *pōṇārkaḷ*, *pōṇīrkaḷ*, etc. are cases of double plurals. Double plurals of this kind are found frequently used in Tēvāram and Nālāyirappirapantam, the literature written between the 6th and 8th centuries A.D. But in the later literature they are not so frequent.

Here it would be very useful to bear in mind that ancient Canarese *gaḷ* and modern Canarese *gaḷu* which correspond to Tamil *kaḷ* are not used in Canarese verbs and that likewise Telugu *lu* (=Tamil *kaḷ*) is not used in Telugu verbs.¹ It would not be difficult to infer from this that the use of *kaḷ* as a pluralizing particle of verbs should have been developed as a special feature of Tamil during the course of its separate development, and that, prior to its separation from Telugu and Canarese, during what might be called the primitive Dravidian period, *kaḷ* did not find any place in the *formation of verbs*. It would also be interesting to observe that Canarese *gaḷ* or *gaḷu* and Telugu *lu* which correspond to Tamil *kaḷ* are occasionally used as the plural suffix in Canarese and Telugu, of rational nouns and pronouns² corresponding to *uyartiṇai* nouns and pronouns in Tamil, and that, in Cilappatikāram for the first time, the form *yāṇkaḷ* occurs with *kaḷ* in *uyartiṇai*, though no verbal form with *kaḷ* is found there. Such *verbal forms* with *kaḷ* are found for the first time in the works of the 6th, 7th and 8th centuries A. D. like Tēvāram, and Nālāyirappirapantam. This induces me to suggest that Canarese Telugu and Tamil may have been separated from one another

1. C. D. G. pp. 555 to 563.

2. *Ibid.* 224.

between the age of Cilappatikāram (5th cent. A.D. circa.) and the age of Tēvāram and Nālāyirappirapantam (6th to 8th cent. A.D.).

IMITATION OF PĀṆINI BY THE AUTHORS OF VĪRACŌLIYAM AND PIRAYŌKAVIVĒKAM: The author of Vīracōliyam does not mention the verbal terminations separately but mentions them along with tense elements as *tān*, *tāl*, *ninrān*, *kirān*, *kirāy*, *kirēn*, etc. He has done so, perhaps because he thought that they should correspond to *ti*, *si*, *mi*, etc. the terminations in Sanskrit, which generally denote both tense and person.

The author of Pirayōkavivēkam has gone too far in importing unnecessarily the terms *ātmanēpada* and *parasmaipada* and explaining them with reference to the Tamil terminations. He states that *paraṣṣaiṣatam* (*parasmaipada*) is used at the end of finite verbs in *kartari* or active voice, the *tañ* or *ārṣanēṣatam* (*ātmanēpada*) is used in *kartari* or active voice, *karmaṇi* or passive voice or *bhāvē* or impersonal form. According to him *paraṣṣaiṣatam* is the termination which ends in a short vowel or has a penultimate short vowel. (e.g.) *kū*, *an*, *aḷ*, *ar*, etc.; *ārṣanēṣatam* is that which ends in a long vowel or has a penultimate long vowel. (e.g.) *mār*, *ai*, *āy*, etc. Both the above terminations are *ārṣanēṣatam* when they are used in the passive voice. The roots which take both the above terminations are called *uṣayaṣati* (*ubhayapadi*). Thus the root *camai* (to cook) which has forms *camaikkinṟanaṇ*, (he cooks) *camaiṣṣān*, (he will cook) *camaikkinṟilan*, (he does not cook) *camaikkinṟān*, (he cooks) *camaiṣṣān*, (he will cook) *camaiyān* (he will not cook) is *uṣayaṣati*; the root *uṇ* with reference to the forms *uṇkirān* *uṇmār*, *uṇṭānai* *uṇṭāy* is *ēkaṣati* in *ārṣanēṣatam* and the same root with reference to the forms *uṇkū*, *uṇṭū*, etc. is *ēkaṣati* in *paraṣṣaiṣatam*.

It is clear that this classification of terminations is quite against the nature of Tamil language and is done solely in imitation of Sanskrit Grammar. Even here it may be noted that in Sanskrit, if a root takes *ātmanēpada* terminations, it takes them in all persons in its conjugation in one tense or mood. (e.g.) *karōmi*, *karōṣi* and *karōti* in the singular of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd persons present, respectively; but in Tamil, *uṇṭū*, the first person singular past tense, is *paraṣṣaiṣatam*, *uṇṭāy*, the 2nd person singular in the same tense is *ārṣanēṣatam* and *uṇṭū*, the 3rd person neuter singular in the same tense is *paraṣṣaiṣatam*. Besides, he says that the verbal form '*camaikkinṟanaṇ*' is used when one cooks for

another and *camaikkinrān* is used when one cooks for himself. Nowhere else is it said so; nor do I see any example in literature in support of this distinction.

Besides, he mentions that the form '*cāttanāl varappaṭum*' as an example for *bhāvēprayōga*. This is exactly the translation of the Sanskrit sentence '*cāttēna āgamyatē*'. Such a sentence, though made up of Tamil words does not seem to me to be a Tamil sentence.¹ His importation of *bhāvēprayōga* too is most inappropriate.

Another most curious point mentioned by him is that 'a' following 'ṇ' in the form *uṇṇappaṭum*, 'ā' following 'ṇ' in *uṇṇāninrān*, 'u' following 'l' in *colluka*, 'ī' following 'r' in *venrīka*, *ta* in *pukutaka*, *tai* in *irintaikka*, *ku* in *araikuvaṇ* are conjugational signs.² Is this not in direct imitation of Sanskrit?

By the way he mentions that he has imported the Sanskritic terms *tiṇ* and *taṇ* in Tamil to make up for the want of Tamil words ending in 'ṇ'.³ By such importation he does more harm than good. The terms *tiṇ* and *taṇ* may be quite intelligible in Sanskrit grammar, but, in Tamil, they are not so, since the Tamil grammarians have not resorted to the devise of using *pratyāhāra* as in Sanskrit.

3.22222112. *TENSE AND TENSE-SIGNS*:—Tolkāppiyānār says that there are three tenses past, present and future.⁴ He does not mention any suffix denoting tense. This fact is noticed by the commentators Cēnāvaraiyar and Nacciṇārkkīniyar and they make mention of the same under the last sūtra of Collatikāram in Tolkāppiyam. But at the same time Tolkāppiyānār mentions that the past tense is used to denote either the present or the future when such actions take place immediately,⁵ and that the past and the present tenses are used to denote the

1. P. V. 36 & its comm.

2. P. V. 41, comm.

3. P. V. 36, comm.

4. *Kālan tāmē mūnṇena molipa*. (Tol. Col. 199.)

Irappi nikaḷvi ṇ-etirvi ṇ-enrā

A-m-mu-k kalamuṇ kurippotuṇ koḷlum

Mey-n-nilai y-uṭaiya tōṇra l-ārē (ibid. 200.)

5. *Vārā-k kālattu nikaḷuṇ kālattum*

Or-āṅki varūum vīnāi-c-cor kiḷavi

Iranta kālattu-k kurippotu kiḷattal

Virainta poruḷa v-enmanār pulavar. (ibid. 241.)

future for the sake of clearness.¹ If distinct tense formations were definitely current in Tolkāppiyaṇār's time, it would be difficult to account for his omission to deal with the distinctive signs for such formations. He mentions, however, three tenses and adds that one may be used for another under certain circumstances as stated above. It is impossible to see how he could speak of one tense form being used for another if it were true that in his days tense formations were not at all differentiated on the morphological side. I am inclined to suggest a solution for this difficulty. It may not be unreasonable to suppose that perhaps, Tolkāppiyaṇār was only thinking of different *tense-values* when he mentioned three tenses; that some of his contemporaries may have begun to associate particular *verbal forms* with particular tense values through the frequency of particular use; and that, with reference to such forms, Tolkāppiyaṇār was probably indicating the circumstances under which overlapping in tense values might be recognised.

The author of Vīracōliyam states that *ta*, *na* and *ya* are added to roots to form the past participle, *kiṛa*, *āninra* and *cu* to form the present participle and *kum*, *um*, *m*, to form the future participle.² Its commentator gives the following as examples under the same stanza for the past participles:—*piṛanta*, *pōṇa* and *āya*.

The author of Naṇṇūl seems to have analysed the above into *t* and *a*, *kiṛu* and *a*, etc. where *t*, *kiṛu*, etc. were taken as tense signs and *a*, the participial sign. According to him, *t*, *t*, *r* and *in* denote the past tense, *kiṛu*, *kinru* and *āninru* denote the present tense and *pa* and *va* denote the future, *ru* and *rum*, and *lu* and *tum* denote the past and the future, *tu* and *tum* denote the past, *ku* and *kum* denote the future, *i* and *mār* denote the future, *pa* the past and the future, *um* the present and the future³. Here it

1. *Vārā-k kālattu viṇai-c-cor kilavi*
Irappinu nikalvinuñ cirappa-t lōnrum
Iyarkai-y-un telivun kilakkun kālai. (ibid. 245.)
2. *Tātu-v-in-pinpu ta-na-ya-v-irappi nikaṭci-y-id-kan*
Otuñ-kiṛa-cū-v-o t-āninra-v-ān-kum-m-um m-ōtu-
ma ∴ kān
Pētamaliyu m-etirin-kan-ākum pīravum-vantāl
Etan-il-catiran tam-pilaiyāma l-iya-rri-k-kollē. (V Tāt. 7.)
3. *Ta-ṭa-ra-v-or r-in-r-ē y-aim-pāl mū-v-iṭattu*
Iranta kālan tarun-toḷi l-iṭai-nilai. (Na. 142.)

must be noted that the verbal terminations *kū*, *tū*, *tū*, *ru*, *kum*, *tum*, *tum*, *rum* are taken to denote not only the person and the number, but also the tense.

Since *t* becomes *ṭ* and *r* respectively after *l* and *n*, and *l* and *n*, *ṭ* and *r* may be regarded as the modification of *t* itself; and hence it seems to me that it would have been sufficient if Nan-*nūlār* had mentioned only *t* and *in* as past tense signs.

ORIGIN OF THE TENSE SIGN 'IN':—The tense sign '*in*' comes after the roots ending in *ū*. It seems to me that the final *ū* of the roots was changed to *i* before *y*¹ so that the forms *aṭakkiya* (P. N. 6. 25.) were formed. The roots like *pō* took only *n* as the past tense sign so that the form *pōnān* was current. Later on the forms like *aṭakkiya* gave place to those like *aṭakkiṇa* so that '*in*' began to be considered as the past tense sign. In the indeclinable participle *i* alone is added in such cases to represent the past tense as *aṭakki*, *uraṅki*, etc. Thus '*i*' which was originally the modified form of *ū* in sandhi may have come to be regarded as a part of the past tense sign.

Besides, there are a few roots in Tamil, as Dr. Caldwell says, which formed their past tense in the ancient period without the addition of any tense sign, but by the reduplication of the final consonant. (e.g.) *pukkanar* (they entered) (Cilap. 342, 196). But even in the ancient period such forms began generally to be superseded by the more regular forms formed by adding tense to roots. (e.g.) *pukuntu* (Cilap. 574, 14).

As regards the future tense, it seems to me that it may have been in its origin later than the past, for it is possible for the primitive people to remember some of their past deeds and express them to others before they begin to think of the future.

Āniṇṇū kiṇṇū kir-mū v-iṭattiṇ

Aim-pāl nikal-polu t-arai-vinai y-iṭai-nilai. (ibid. 143.)

Pa-v-va mū-v-iṭat t-ai-m-pā l-etir-polutū

Icai-viṇai y-iṭai-nilai y-ām-ivai cila-v-ila. (ibid. 144.)

Ra-v-v-o tukara v-ummai-nikal p-alla-vum

Ta-v-v-o t-iṇṇappu m-etirvum ta-v-v-otū

Kalivum ka-v-v-ō t-etirvum-miṇ n-ēval

Viyaṅkō l-i-m-mā retirvum pāntam

Celavoṭū varavum ceyyu-nikal p-etirvum

Etir-marai mummai-yu m-ērku m-iṅkē. (ibid. 145.)

1. *Yakaram varu-vali y-ikaran kurukum*

Ukara-k kilavi tuvara-t tōṇṇātū. (Tol. E. 411.)

This is clearly seen in the case of children. The only future that would have been possible then was that conveyed by the command which is expressed by the imperative second person.

The present tense may, in all probability, have been the last in the formation, since it is not quite necessary on the part of a speaker to express to another what is actually happening since he himself is witnessing it. The present tense forms in Tamil with the signs *kinru*, *āniru*, etc. are almost absent in the works of Sangam period. I was able to find out one form *cērkinra* in Paripāṭal (p. 163, 35). Such forms are very frequent only in the literature of the medieval period. (e.g.) *enkinrāl* in each of 10 stanzas in Tēvāram, pp. 25 and 26; *enkinrālāl* in Periyatirumoli of Nālāyirappirapantam, pp. 154 and 155; *cellāninra āṇṭu* (T. A. S. i, 14); *parāninrārai* (T. 1. 51).

The forms *unkirān*, *unkinrān*, *unṇāninrān*, *unṇākiṭantān*, *unṇāviruntān* appear to me to have been two words which were, later on, mistaken for one; for the commentator on Vīracōliyam says that the forms *ninrān*, *kiṭantān*, *iruntān*, etc., are derived from the roots *nil*, *kiṭa*, *iru*, etc. and are used as the personal terminations after roots in the present tense.¹ Cēṇāvaraiyar, a commentator on Tolkāppiyam repeats the same thing. Hence *unṇā* and *ninrān* were, at one time, two words of which *unṇā* was a participle (modified form of *unṇū*) and *ninrān* was the finite verb. This may be seen from the following two examples:—*iravā ninrān* (Kampar. A. 239. 38.); *tērrā ninrān* (Kampar. A. 249. 52.) where *iravā* and *tērrā* are affirmative indeclinable participles. Later on *nil* of *ninrān* in *unṇāninrān* began to be taken as an auxiliary verb. *Unṇāninrān* should have originally meant 'he is eating', the past tense *ninrān* being used to denote the immediateness of the action. The above explanation holds good for the forms *unṇāninrān*, *unṇākiṭantān* and *unṇāviruntān*. But what should have been the origin of *unkirān* and *unkinrān*? The form *unkirēn* which is very often used in colloquial speech is said to be the later form by Naccinārkkiniyar² and it is not generally found in Tamil classics up to 12th century. Hence it may be considered to have been the modified form of

1. *Nil enṇun tātuviniṇrū iranta-kāla-p-paṭar-kkaiyil ninrān mutaliya pirattiyayaṅkal nikal-kāla-p-porulil varum.* (V. K. 4, comm.)

2. *Unkirēn-ena-k kiru enpatu nikalkālam unarttutal i-k-kāla-valakkū.* (Tol. Col. 202, Nac.)

uṇkinṛān. The form *ākinṛi* as the finite verb is found in the following lines of *Puranānūri*:—

Peṇṇuruvu oru-tiraṇ ākinṛi (the form of a woman is on one side). (P.N. 1.7.)

Pirai-nūtal vaṇṇam-ā kinṛi (crescent forms a source of beauty to the forehead). (P.N. 1.9.)

This may have been formed from *ā* (root) + *ku* (*cāriyai*) + *iṇ* (*cāriyai*) + *ri* (the neuter sign termination). Could *ākinṛān* have been formed by adding *ān* to *ākinṛi* mistaking it to be the indeclinable participle? Or as Dr. Graul, Dr. Gundert and M. J. Vinson opine, *kinṛi* may have been formed from *k* a sign of the future in Tamil and *iṇri* meaning now.¹

The author of *Nannūl* plainly says that *kiru* and *kinṛi* and *āninṛi* are the present tense signs, though *k* of *kiru* and *kinṛi* in forms like *uṇkirān* and *uṇkinṛān* is the final element of the previous word, like *uṇku*, and *iṇ* is the initial element of the following word, and *ā* of *āninṛi* in the form like *uṇṇāninṛān* is the final element of the affirmative indeclinable participles like *uṇṇā*, and *ninṛi* is the initial element of *ninṛān*.

In modern times, the past perfect, the present perfect and the future perfect are used with a past participle and the finite verbal form in the past, present and future of the root *iru*. e. g. *ceyti iruntān* (he had done), *ceytirukkinṛān* (he has done), *ceyti irupṇān* (he would have done). Similarly, the forms of the past perfect continuous, the present perfect continuous and the future perfect continuous are also found. e.g. *ceytukoṇṭiruntān*, *ceytukoṇṭirukkinṛān*, *ceytukoṇṭirupṇān*.

The past and the future tenses may respectively correspond to the aorist and the second future in Sanskrit. The causal verbs also are used in all the three tenses in the same way as simple verbs. The latter is formed by adding to the root, the tense sign and the personal termination, while the former by adding to the root, the causal suffix *vi* or *pi*, the tense sign and the personal terminations or by adding the tense sign and the personal terminations to the causal form of the root as *ākki*, *tirutti*, etc.

3.2222212. **ACTIVE NEGATIVE VOICE:** Tolkāppiaṇār has hinted about the active negative voice in his statement

1. C. D. G. 494 and J. A. Onzieme Serie Tome XIII, p. 116.

that case-suffixes will be used even after nouns qualifying a negative verb,¹ and also has mentioned the term *etirmarai* in the sūtra

Ecca v-ummai-y-u m-etirmarai y-ummai-y-um
Tattam-un mayañku m-uṭanilai y-ilavē.

(Tol. Col. 283.)

From the literature of the Sangam and medieval periods we may infer that the negation was expressed in six ways:—

(1) By inserting the negative particle *al* between the root and the personal termination.

e. g. *cel-l-al-am* (we will not go). (P.N. 101.1.)

aṛi-y-al-aṇ (he does not know). (P.N. 239.9.)

(2) By inserting the negative particle *al* or *il* between the tense sign and the personal termination.

e. g. *cirantanṛi* (it is not desirable). (P.N. 75.5.)

urai-t-t-il-aṇ (he did not say). (P.T. 205.12.)

kaṇ-ṭ-il-ēṇ (I have not seen). (P.T. 202.2.)

(3) By inserting *il* followed by the personal terminations after the affirmative finite forms of verbs.

(e.g.) *muyaṇkinēṇ-allēṇ* (I was not befooled). (P.N. 19.7.)

celvēṇ allēṇ (we will not go). (P.N. 36.11)

ollāṇ allāṇ (he will not agree). (P.N. 97.21.)

peruvār-alar (they will not receive). (P.T. 200.5.)

(4) By inserting the vowel *ā* between the root and the tense sign. (This is seen clearly in the third person neuter singular.)

(e.g.) *ākātū* (it will not become). (Tol. E. 71.)

mutalātū (it will not commence). (Tol. E. 65.)

pēṇātū (it will not agree). (T. 2.6.)

(5) By adding the personal terminations directly to the root.

(e.g.) *kāṇēṇ* (I will not see). (P.N. 71.5.)

ollāy (you will not agree). (P.N. 31.6.)

ollāṇ (he will not agree). (P.N. 78.9.)

vaiyārkaḷē (They will not despise). (P.T. 204.10.)

1. *Etir-maruttu molī-y-iṇ-un tatta marapir*

Poruṇilai tiriyā vērrumai-c collē. (Tol. col. 107.)

(6) By lengthening the *a* of roots like *var*¹ and adding the personal terminations.

(e.g.) *vārēm* (we will not come). (P.N. 145.4.)

The author of *Vīracōliyam* states that *ān*, *āl*, *ār*, *ārkaḷ*, *atū*, *ā*, *ilan*, *ilal*, *ilar*, *ilarkaḷ*, *ilatū*, *ila* and others like *atōḷi* are added after roots to denote *tatai-p-poruḷ* or negative meaning.² Its commentator adds that the verbs having the first six terminations denote the future tense, and the verbs having the next six denote the past tense when they (*ilan*, etc.) are preceded by *t*, as in *naṭantilan*, and the present tense when they are preceded by *k*, as in *naṭakkilan*. But I am at a loss to know why he did not add the first and the second personal terminations along with the first six and *alēn*, *alai*, *alan*, *alar*, etc. along with the next six.

The authors of *Nannūl* and *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* have stated about the negative voice only with respect to *ā*, the termination of the neuter plural. It is the Rev. C. J. Beschi who has definitely stated that in *marai-vinai* personal terminations are *directly* added to roots without any tense sign between them and that *ātū* is the termination that is added to the root in the third person neuter singular.

At present we have certain forms of verbs which are common both to affirmative and negative voices, *ceyyāy* and *ceyyīr*, the second person singular and plural forms respectively. The indeclinable participles *ceyyā*, *uṇṇā* also come under that category.

The author of *Ilakkaṇakkottū* gives the following examples to illustrate the identity of *viti* or affirmative form and *marai* or negative form. (e.g.) *vallār tirai koṭuppar* (the weak will pay tribute), *vallār tirai koḷvar* (the strong will take tribute), *arulān* (one who has the favour or one who has not the favour),

1. it seems to me that the root in *varukinrān* and *varuvān* was originally *var*, though in modern times *vā* is taken to be the root. cf. Tel. *rā* (come.)

2. *Ān-āl-ār-ārkaḷ-oṭ-ātu-ā-v-ilan-mar-r-ilal-ilar-um*
Tān-ām-ilarka-l-ilatū-ila-tātū-t tatai-p-poruṭ-kaṇ
Mēnām-uraitta marapē-varumikka vātoli-mun
Nānāvulamarri naratai-mannum pira-ttiyamē.

vekulāṇ (one who is irritable or one who is not irritable).¹ C. J. Beschi says *nōvāṇ* is common to both (It means, he won't suffer or he will suffer). Similarly one of the commentators on Nannūl says that *cāvāṇ* means, either he will die or he won't die.

These examples show that the fact whether they denote negation or assertion is ascertained either from the context or *perhaps* from the difference in the position of the accent. As regards the words like *ceyyāy* and *ceyyīr*, they seem to have had the accent on the first syllable if they denoted assertion and on *ā* or *ī* if they denoted negation. Originally, they may have been respectively imperative second person singular and plural. The same may have been pronounced with such a tone as to convey interrogative sense as is done even now. From such interrogative uses, the negative meanings of such forms may have been developed.

WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF 'Ā' OF ĀTU IN MUTALĀTŪ?
VĀRĀTŪ, Etc. *Ā* is said by Tolkāppiyaṇār to be one of the terminations added to verbal themes to denote neuter plural, and it is not stated there that it denotes neuter plural only in the negative voice; but he uses such verbs as *ākā* in Tol. E. 60, *navilā* in Tol. E. 74, *mikā* in Tol. E. 263 only with a negative meaning. The author of Nannūl has definitely stated that *ā* is used to denote neuter plurals only in the negative voice.² Hence I think that *ā* began to be considered in the earliest times as the particle of negation in neuter plural. Afterwards, forms like *tiriyatū*³, *mutalātū*⁴ which are found in Tolkāppiyam may have been formed by adding the neuter singular termination *tū* to the theme formed by the root with the negative particle *ā* suffixed to it. Then this particle *ā* may have been used in verbal nouns like *ceyyāmai* and then it may have given room to the idea that it (*ā*) existed even in the form *ceyyāy*.⁵

1. *Vallār tirai-kolvar, vallār tirai-koṭuppar; . . . arulāṇ vekulāṇ ivai col-l-onrē viti-viṇaiyum marai-viṇai-y-um-āyina.* (I K. p. 39.)

2. *Aā irra pala-v-in paṭarkkai*

Ā-v-ē etir-marai-k kaṇṇa tākum. (Na. 329.)

3. *Yā-v-eṇ viṇā-v-u m-ā-y-ia ririyātū.* (Vol. E. 176.)

4. *Ā-v-ō ṭallatū yakara mutalātū.* (ibid. 65.)

5. *Etir-marai-k-kaṇ marai-y-uṇarttum*

iṭai-nilai-y-u m-uṇmaiyāṇ. (Vol. Col. 450, Cēṇā.)

If so, how are we to account for the participial form *ceyyā* in *ceyyāninrān* which denotes affirmation. Tolkāppiyaṇār has not mentioned it. Cēṇāvaraiyar says that *ceyyū* was changed to *ceyyā*. Hence *ā* of the verbal participle *ceyyā* in *ceyyāninrān* is not a negative particle. Later on, *ceyyā* may have been used as a negative particle also.

3.2222213. *PASSIVE AFFIRMATIVE VOICE*: Tolkāppiyaṇār has not stated anything about the passive affirmative voice or *viti-c-ceyappāṭṭuvinaṭai* as is called by the author of Ilakkaṇakkottū. But in connection with third case he (Tolkāppiyaṇār) states that the third case-suffix is used to denote the *kartā* or the doer of the action also. This is possible only if passive voice was current in his time. Besides he uses the expression *ena-p-paṭuṭa* in Tol. E. 1. But passive forms are rare in the literature of the ancient period. (e.g.) *kaiṭṭaṭukkaṭṭāy nī* (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 548. 15). In the literature and inscriptions of the medieval period, verbs in passive voice are frequently used.

(e.g.) *ceyyaṭṭaṭadu* (it was done). (Ep. I. Vol. XVII. Part VII. V. G. p. 330, line 30 & 31.)

irakkaṭṭaṭadu (it was taken down). (*Ibid.* line 112.)

ennaṭṭaṭadu (it was said so). (*Ibid.* line 110.)

kuḍukkaṭṭaṭadu (it was given). (I.A. Vol. 22, p. 71 M. M.P.) (for *koḍukkappaṭṭadu*.)

ilittaṭṭerukuvatākavum (so that it may be despised). (S. I. I. ii, 509.)

kaṭṭaṭṭaṭṭu (having been built). (T. 20, 6.)

On the basis of these later passive formations, the author of *Vīracōliyam* has stated that in the *karmakāra* or passive voice, the root *paṭu*, or some other one is added to the original root followed by 'a' and then the personal terminations are added.¹ Its commentator mentions *taku* in addition to *paṭu*. From the fifth example mentioned above, the root *peru* also may be added to the list,

-
1. *Vinaṭai-k-kurippōṭu karumam-paṭarkkaiyṇ mikka-v-onrai*
Anaittenṇalām-a-v voṭu-paṭu-t-tāṭu-pinn-ām-iyarkai
Taṇai-k-karumam-perun tāṭu-k-kaṇ-marṇum paṭu-vinaṭai-
pōl
Niṇaikka-varu-mar r-ivaiyum-peyarcco nikarttitumē. (V. K. 11.)

The author of Nannūl has not mentioned anything about it. The author of Pirayōkavivēkam mentions it in the commentary on P. V. 36. The author of Ilakkaṇakkottū agrees with the author of Vīracōliyam and adds that the active form itself may be used for the passive.¹ Examples for the latter are found in the Sangam works.

valāii (for *valaikkaṇṇaṭṭu*) (having been surrounded).
(P.N. 18, 1.)

talīi for (*taluvappaṭṭu*) (having been adhered to). (Pattu. 224. 301.)

It seems to me that, before the time of Vīracōliyam and even for some time after him, the expressions *aṛiyaṇṇaṭṭān*, *aṛiyatla-kuvān* may have been viewed as made up of two words *aṛiya* and *ṇaṭṭān* and *aṛiya* and *takuvān*. This is perhaps the reason why Nannūlār has not mentioned it. Besides, passive voice is also formed, as Dr. Caldwell says, 'by means of the preterite verbal participle of any neuter active verb followed by the preterite third person singular neuter of the verbs to become, to be, to go, or occasionally to end.'² (e.g.) *atu muṭintatū*, (it was finished); *atu muṭintāyirri* (it was finished). Sometimes, expressions like *aṭi unṭān* for *aṭikkaṇṇaṭṭān* also are used. I quite agree with Dr. Caldwell that in Colloquial Tamil 'the root *paṭu* is sometimes added even to intransitive roots and sometimes to denote, other than passive signification³ (e.g.) *nān nanrāy cāṇṇiṭappaṭṭavan* does not mean 'I have been well-eaten, but I am accustomed to eat well!'

But on the whole, the genius of the Tamil language is to avoid the passive voice as far as possible. This is one of the important points where Tamil differs from Sanskrit.

3.222214. *PASSIVE NEGATIVE VOICE* ; The passive negative voice is formed in the same way as the passive affirmative voice, except that the particles of negation are added here to the roots followed by such auxiliary verbs as *paṭu*. Hence the following forms may be had :

ciraṇṇaṭṭatanri (it is not considered advisable).

kāṇappaṭṭilatū (it was not found).

1. I. K. p. p. 44 and 45.

2. C. D. G. 464.

3. *Ibid.* 468.

uraikkappaṭṭinrū (it was not said).
kāṇappaṭṭēn (I will not be found).
kāṇappaṭṭān (he will not be found).
kāṇappaṭṭāti (it will not be found).
kāṇappaṭṭēnallēn (I will not be found).

Such a use of negative voice is not at all found in Sanskrit and is a peculiar development in Tamil language.

3.222222. IMPERATIVE MOOD : 3.2222221. AFFIRMATIVE VOICE : Tolkāppiyaṇār mentions that the form *ceyyāy* of the second person singular is sometimes used as *cey*¹ and in such cases *ī* or *ē* preceded by a suitable consonant are added after it,² as *cenrī* (from the root *cel*) and *ninmē* (from the root *niḷ*). This evidently holds good in the affirmative voice. He has not definitely stated the exact forms that should be used in the imperative mood. But from the literature of the Sangam period we are able to understand that the forms *ceyyāy*, *cey*, *ceyyi*, *ceyyī* and *ceyyai* were used as second person singular and *ceyyīr* and *ceymiṇ* as second person plural in the affirmative voice of the imperative mood.

(e.g.) *aṟiyāy* (know). (A.N. 268. 1.)
kēḷ (listen). (Pattu. 131. 38.)
cel (go). (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 477. 32.)
varaiti (allot). (P.N. 8. 7.)
cenrī (go). (Ka. T. Vol. 542. 15.)
kaṇṭi (find). (*Ibid.* 542, 8.)
kēṭṭai (listen). (*Ibid.* 546. 23.)
kāṇīr (see). (Cilap. 209. 12. & 265. 226.)
cērmīṇ (reach). (P.N. 9. 5.)

In the literature of the medieval period, the form *ceymiṇkaḷ* formed by adding *kaḷ* to the plural from *ceymiṇ* is frequently used. (e.g.) *tolūmiṇkaḷ* (T. 32. 9.) *cērmīṇkaḷē* (P.T. 58, 1).

The author of Vīracōliyam mentions that the root form like *cey* is used as the second person singular, the forms like *ceyyum*, *ceymiṇ* and *ceyyāmē* as honorific singular and the forms like

-
1. *Ceyyā y-enṇu munṇilai viṇai-c-cor*
Cey-y-eṇ kiḷavi y-ākīṭa n-utaittē. (Tol. Col. 450.)
 2. *Munṇilai munṇa r-ī-y-u m-ē-y-um*
Anṇilai marapiṇ mey-y-ūrntū varumē. (*ibid.* 451.)

ceyyuṅkaḷ and *ceymiṅkaḷ* as the second person plural in the affirmative voice of the imperative mood.¹

As regards the form *ceyyum* it was used at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār only as the third person singular and third person neuter plural in the indicative mood². If that is so, we have to explain how the same form began to be used in honorific singular of the second person imperative mood at the time of Vīracōḷiyam. It seems to me that the latter form is not the same *ceyyum* but is the corrupted form of *ceymiṅ* or *ceymē* through the intermediate stage *ceyum*. Still the old form *ceyyum* was used in the Tolkāppiyaṇ sense by *Kamṇar*—*malai-k-kunṇamaṇaiyāṇ varum* (Kamṇar. A. 214. 2.), *kaiyai-k-kaiyinerikkum* (Kamṇar. A. 220. 11). In the colloquial speech of modern days *ceyyum* is used only in the honorific singular. The form *ceyyāmē* may have been originally used in the sense 'let us go' where 'us' refers to the person spoken to and the speaker and then was used as the second person honorific singular. But this form seems to be extinct now.

Naṇṇūlār follows the author of Vīracōḷiyam as regards the singular³ but mentions the termination *miṇ* alone as regards the plural.⁴

At the present day the forms that are used in the affirmative voice of the imperative mood, in colloquial speech, are the same as those mentioned by the author of Vīracōḷiyam except the form *ceyyāmē*.

-
1. *Ōṅkāta-muṇṇilai-p pāl-ēval-āṅkā l-orum aiy-ir-cu-p*
Pāṅkā-r-cirappilā mēyu-miṇ-ka-p-paṇmai y-ām-iṭattu
Niṅkāta-miṅkaḷuṇ kaḷḷām-icai-v-iṇ-ir ka-v-v-eṇṇpatāṇ
Tāṅkā-p-parōkka-t tiṇir-pōlum-ām-eṇṇpar tāḷ-kulalē. (V. K. 9.)
 2. *Pallōr paṭarkkai muṇṇilai taṇmai*
A-v-vayin mūṇru nikaḷuṇ kālattuc
Ceyyu m-eṇṇun kiḷavi-y-oṭu koḷḷā. (Tol. Col. 227.)
 3. *Naṭa-vā maṭi-cī viṭu-kū vē-vai*
No-p-pō vaṇ-v-uri ṇ-uṇ-porun tiruntin
Tēy-pār cel-v-v vāl-kē ḷ-a : kenṇu
Eytiya-v-irupāṇ mūṇrā m-irravum
Cey-y-e ṇ-ēval viṇai-p-pakā-p patamē. (Na. 137.)
 53. *Ir-ir irṇa irāṇu m-iru-tiṇai-p*
Paṇmai muṇṇilai miṇ-avar rēval. (Na. 337.)

It seems to me that the form *ceyya vēṇṭum* has also been used in the imperative mood since the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār.¹ This form appears to be a kind of periphrastic formation made up of the gerundial form of a root followed by *vēṇṭum*—the future form of the root *vēṇṭu* primarily signifying request. Perhaps this periphrastic formation was devised to supply the gap in the first and third persons in the imperative system.

3.222222. **NEGATIVE VOICE** : Tolkāppiyaṇār has not definitely stated any form to represent the negative voice in the imperative mood, though he has used the two words *aliyal* and *añcal* in the second person singular, imperative negative voice in Tol. Poruḷ. 146. But from the literature of the different periods we may say that the following forms *ceyyal*, *ceyyāy*, *ceyyāli*, *ceyyēl* were used in the singular and *ceyyīr* in the plural. (e.g.)

ṭeyaral (do not change). (P. N. 3. 14.)

ēkal (do not go). (Kampar. A. 225. 19.)

nīṇkāy (do not go away). (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 470. 21.)

nillāti (do not stand). (Ibid. 468. 21.)

uḷ aliyyēl (do not feel sorry). (Kampar. A. 225. 18.)

ayarēl (do not feel sorry). (Kampar. A. 239. 38.)

ayarīr (Plural). (Kampar. A. 275. 87.)

Besides it seems the form *ceyyavēṇṭā* was used both in the singular and the plural. (e.g.) *nī varuntavēṇṭā* (P. N. 101. 10).

In modern times the forms that are used in colloquial speech are *ceyyāy* or *ceyyātē* in the singular, *ceyyātēyum* in the honorific singular and *ceyyātīr* or *ceyyātēyūṇkal* in the plural.

It appears that, at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār and the author of Vīracōḷiyam, the imperative mood expressed not only command but also request, wish, etc. more or less in the same way as the imperative in Sanskrit. This is clearly seen from the statements of Tolkāppiyaṇār² and the author of Vīracōḷiyam³ that the

1. *Itu-ceyal vēṇṭu m-eṇṇuṇ kilavi*

Iru-vayi nīlaiyum poruṭ-t-ā kum-mē

Taṇṭā l-ānum pīraṇ-pā l-ānum. (Tol. Col. 243.)

2. *Avarruḷ*

Munṇilai taṇmai y-ā-y-i-r-iṭattotū

Maṇṇā t-ākum viyāṇkōṭ kilavi. (Tol. Col. 226.)

3. *Oṇkāta-munṇilai-p-pāl-ēval-āṇkā l-orumai-y-ir-cu-p*

Pāṇkā-cirappitā mē-y-u miṇ-ka-p-paṇmai-y-ām-iṭattū

Nīṇkāta-miṇkal-uṇ kal-l-ām-icai-v-iṇirka-v-v-eṇpatān

Tāṇkā-p-parōkka-t t-in-ir-pōlum-ām-eṇpar-tāl-kulalē.

(V. K. 9.)

optative mood is used only in the third person singular and plural. But at the time of Nannūlar, it seems to me that the imperative began to be restricted only to denote command and the optative began to be used to denote wish, request, etc. since he says that the optative forms like *celka*, *celliya* and *celliyar* could be used in both singular and plural of all persons.

There is one difference between the imperative mood in Tamil and that in Sanskrit; in the former, it is used only in the second person, except in the case of instances like *ceyyaveṇṭum* which appear to represent a type of periphrastic imperative formation as explained above, whereas in the latter, it is used in all persons.

3.222223. OPTATIVE MOOD : 3.2222231. AFFIRMATIVE VOICE : Active voice in the optative mood in Tamil verbs expresses request, injunction, wish, etc. in the same way as the Sanskrit potential and benediction as the Sanskrit benedictive. Tolkāppiyānār mentions that *viyaṅkōl* or optative mood is used only in the third person, both singular and plural where it has the same form in *āṇpāl*, *peṇpāl*, *palarpāl*, *onṇaṇpāl* and *palaviṇpāl*.¹ But what its form is he does not seem to have mentioned. He uses the verbs *arital* and *kāṭṭal* as optative mood in Tol. Col. 458 and 463 respectively.

The author of Vīracōliyam agrees with Tolkāppiyānār in the meaning and the use of the optative mood and improves upon him by saying that its form is obtained by adding 'ka' to the roots.² Nannūlar differs from them both in its application and the form. It is used in all persons and numbers and the forms mentioned are *ceyka*, *ceyyiya* and *ceyyiyar*.³ The author of Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam agrees with Nannūlar in its application, but as regards its formation he adds the forms ending in *al*, *āl*, *um*, *mār* and *ai*.⁴

-
1. *Eñciya kiḷavi y-iṭattoṭu ciṇai*
Ai-m-pārku m-uriya tōṇra l-ārē. (Tol. Col. 225.)
Avarṇul
Munṇilai taṇmai y-ā-yī r-iṭattoṭu
Mannā t-ākum viyaṅkōṭ kiḷavi. (ibid. 226.)
 2. V. K. 9. See F.N. p. 156, 3.
 3. *Ka-ya-v-oṭu ra-v-v-or r-irra viyaṅkōl*
Iyalu m-iṭam-pā l-eṅku m-eṇpa. (Na. 338.)
 4. *Ka-ya-v-oṭu ra-v-v-or r-al-āl um-mār*
Ai-kā nīrra viyaṅkōṇ murravai
Eytu m-iṭam-pā l-eṅku m-eṇpa. (I. V. 239.)

HISTORY OF GRAMMATICAL THEORIES IN TAMIL

BY

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI,

Principal, Raja's College of Skt. and Tamil Studies, Tiruvadi.

The opinion of the author of the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* seems to me to be the most acceptable when we take into consideration the forms used in the literature from the Sangam period onwards. He has himself given quotations in his commentary on the *sūtra* 239. The following may be added to them.

vāliya nī (May you live long) (Ka. T. Vol., 2. 583. 21.)

vāliyar yān (May I live long). (P. N. 365. 9.)

vāliyar pala (May many prosper). (P. N. 371. 25.)

nī vāliyar (May you live long). (P. N. 137. 14.)

ceytēn ākuka (May I be considered to have done it).
(P. N. 71. 9.)

celvai y-ākuvai (May you be considered to have gone)
(P. N. 70. 15.)

(The last two may be regarded as periphrastic formations.) In addition to these it seems the form *ceyyāy* also was used in the second person singular of the affirmative voice of the optative mood. (e.g.) *kāvāy kōvē* (Oh-king! may you protect) (Kampar. A. 241. 41.)

In colloquial speech such forms as *vālaṭṭum*, *vālakkaṭavān* *vālakkaṭavāl* etc., are generally used in the third person.

3.222232. **NEGATIVE VOICE:** In the negative voice such forms as '*peyaral*' formed by adding the negative particle *al* to the root are found. e.g., *niṇ cor peyaral* (P. N. 3. 14.) which means 'may your command never change'. They may have arisen under the following conditions:—Forms like *peyarāy-allāy* may have been in use in the second person singular similar to *celvēṁ allēṁ* (P. N. 36, 11) in the first person plural, *ollāṇ allāṇ* (P. N. 97, 21) in the third person singular. Then *peyarāy-allāy* may have been reduced to *peyar-al* in the same way as *ceyyāy* to *cey*. Or forms like *peyar-alāy* may have been in use similar to *cel-*

lalam (P. N. 101, 1), *ariyalam* (P.N. 239, 9.) and they may have been reduced to *peyar-al*.

In colloquial Tamil at present the form *vālāyāka* (I wish you not to prosper) is generally used in the negative voice. This may be considered to be a periphrastic formation made up of a negative verb in the negative voice of the indicative mood and the optative affirmative form *āka* of the root 'ā'.

3.222224. *ECCAM* or *INFINITIVE MOOD* : *Eccam* is primarily divided into two classes *peyar-eccam* and *vinai-y-eccam*.

3.2222241. *PEYAR-ECCAM* : *Peyar-eccam* corresponds to the participle in Sanskrit. It is of four kinds :—active affirmative relative participle, active negative relative participle, passive affirmative relative participle and passive negative relative participle. Each of these may be further divided into three according as it denotes the past, present or future action. Invariably each qualifies a noun following it.

3.22222411. *ACTIVE AFFIRMATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE* : According to Tolkāppiyāṇār the form *ceyta* is the past active affirmative relative participle and the form *ceyyum* is both the present and the future active affirmative relative participle.¹ The finite verbs, which take 'in' as in *uraṅkiṇān* to denote the past, have their active affirmative relative participle in the form *uraṅkiya*. (e.g.,) *maṇ ṭiṇinta nilaṇum* (The land full of earth) (P. N. 2. 1.) ; *nilaṇ ēntiya vicumpum* (The sky which is above the land) (P.N. 2. 2.) ; *muttī-vilakkil tuṇcum porḱōṭṭimayamum* (P. N. 2. 23, 24.) (The Himalayas with gold peaks where sleep (the deer) in the light of triad-fire). Here *tuṇcum* is the present relative participle; *teṇpula vālnarkku aruṅkaṭaṇ irukkum* *putalvar* (sons who offer oblations to manes residing in the south) (P. N. 9. 3). Here *irukkum* is the future relative participle. The form *ceykinra* as the present active affirmative relative participle is scarcely found anywhere in Sangam works. I came across the word 'cērkinra' in the sentence 'cērikinra kaṅkaviṇ, in Paripāṭal (Pari. 163. 35). This may be taken as a participial noun in the plural number meaning "those that join" and qualifying the plural

1. *Nilanum poruḷ-uṇ kalam-uṇ karuvi-y-um*
Vinai-mutaṇ kiḷavi-y-um vinai-y-u m-ula-p-paṭa
A-v-v-aru poruṭkum-ō r-anna v-urimaiya
Ceyyūñ ceyta v-eṇṇuñ collē. (Tol. Col. 234.)

noun *kaṇ*. The form *iravāninra*, which is found in Kural 1157 may be explained in the same way.

But in the literature and inscriptions of the medieval period, present active affirmative participles of the forms *ceykinra* and *ceyyāninra* are found in large numbers.

(e.g.) *celvam-uyarkinra celvar* (Rich men who are becoming richer). (T. 1. 5.)

cellāninra āṇṭu (The year which is passing). (T. A. S. i. 14.)

It also seems to me that the form *ceykiṛa* was very frequent in colloquial speech of that period. Hence the author of the *Vīra-cōliyam* says that the present participle is formed by adding *kiṛa*, *āninra* or *cu* to the root. The past participle is formed according to him by the addition of *ta*, *na* or *ya* and the future participle by that of *kum* or *um*.¹ In the example *cey cāttan*, he seems to take *cey* and *cāttan* as separate words where *cey* is the present active affirmative relative participle which is formed by adding the participle *cu* (corresponding to *su*, the nominative singular suffix in Sanskrit) which is evidently dropped afterwards. This is done by him only to get the designation *pada* to *cey*, since, according to him, *pada* is 'suptiṇantam.' But *ceycāttan* may be taken as a compound and hence it would have been better if he had omitted it. In *kiṛa* and *āninra* mentioned by him it seems to me that 'a' is the sign of the participle and *kiṛu* and *āninru* are the present tense signs. I do not know why he failed to mention the form *ceykinra* which was frequently used in the works that were written before his time.

The author of *Nannūl* follows him, but substitutes the form *ceykinra* for the form *ceykiṛa*.² The author of the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam*

1. *Tātu-v-in-pinpu ta-na-ya-v-irappi nikaṭci-y-in-kaṇ*
Otuṇ-kiṛa-cu-v-v-o ṭ-āninra-v-ān-kum-m-um m-ōṭu-maṣ
kāṇ

Pētamali-y-u m-etirin-kaṇ-ākum piṛavum-vantāl
Ētam-il catirān-tam-pilai-y-ā ma l-iyarri-k-kollē.

(V. Tāt. 7.)

2. *Ceyta ceykinra ceyyum-en-pāṭṭil*
Kālam-uñ ceyal-un tōnri-p-pāl-otū
Ceyva t-āti aru-poruṭ peyarum
Eñca nīṣṭatu peyar-ec cam-m-ē. (Na. 340.)

follows Nannūlar.¹

3.22222412. *ACTIVE NEGATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE* : In the ancient period only the form *ceyyāta* seems to have been in use and it may have been used in all tenses. (e.g.) *ṣayan illāta col* (word which is of no use) (K. 198). Even now the form *ceyyāta* is used in all tenses though more frequently in the past and the future : (e.g.)

itai-c-ceyyāta ṣayan aṭikkapṣaṭṭān (the boy who did not do this was beaten). (Colloq.)

itai-c-ceyyāta ṣayan aṭikkapṣaṭṭukirān (the boy who does not do this is beaten). (Colloq.)

itai-c-ceyyāta ṣayan aṭikkapṣaṭṭuvān (the boy who will not do this will be beaten). (Colloq.)

Besides the form *ceyyāta*, the periphrastic forms *ceyyāmal irunta*, *ceyyāmal irukkinra* and *ceyyāmal irukkum* are respectively used in the past, present and future tenses.

3.22222413. *PASSIVE AFFIRMATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE*. In the works of the ancient period perhaps except in Kural it seems that there was no form belonging to this class. In the later periods the forms *ceyyapṣaṭṭa*, *ceyyapṣaṭṭukinra* and *ceyyapṣaṭṭum* are used in the past, present and future tense respectively. (e.g.)

kuyavanār ceyyapṣaṭṭa kuṭam (pot which was made by the potter). (Colloq.)

taccaṇār ceyyapṣaṭṭukinra nārkalī (chair which is made by the carpenter). (Colloq.)

aracaṇār kaṭṭapṣaṭṭum māḷikai (palace built by the king). (Colloq.)

3.22222414. *PASSIVE NEGATIVE RELATIVE PARTICIPLE* : As in the case of forms of passive affirmative relative participle, it seems to me that there were no forms for this in the ancient period except in Kural. In the later periods, the form *ceyyapṣaṭṭāta* was used in all tenses. In modern times the periphrastic forms *ceyyapṣaṭṭāmal-irunta*, *ceyyapṣaṭṭāmal irukkinra* and

1. *Avarrul*

Ceyta ceykinra ceyyum-eṇ pāṭṭil

Ceyva t-āti aru-poruṭ peyar-oṭū

Muṭiyu muraiyatū peyar-ec cam-m-ē. (I. V. 243.)

ceyyappaṭāmal-irukkum are also found used in the past, present and future tenses respectively. (e.g.) *kēṭkaṭṭāta cevi* (K. 418).

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam says that the suffix denoting the active participles corresponds to *śatṛpratyaya* and *kānac pratyaya* in Sanskrit and the passive participles like *ceyyappaṭṭa* end in *kānacpratyaya*. It must be noted here that *śatṛ* and *kānac* in *gaccan* and *ganyamāna* are two entirely different *pratyayas*, while 'a' in *ceyta* and *ceyyappaṭṭa* is one and the same.

3.22222415. *WHAT IS THE ORIGIN OF 'A', THE ENDING OF THE PRESENT AND PAST PARTICIPLES CEYKINRA, IRAVĀNINRA, CEYTA, ETC.?* From the use of the words *ceykinra* and *iravāninra* in the Paripāṭal and the Kural¹ respectively qualifying plural nouns *kaṇ* and *vaḷai*, it seems to me that *ceykinra*, *iravāninra* and *ceyta* may have been the nominative neuter plurals of the neuter singular forms *ceykinrū*, *iravāninrū*,² *ceyṭū*, when they were used as participial nouns. I have already shown at some length how the finite verbal forms could be used as participial nouns and declined in all cases. Originally they may have been used to qualify neuter plural nouns, but later on, since the neuter plural nouns like *kaṇ*, *tuḷai*, etc. had the same form as the singular as an alternative for *kaṇkal*, *tuḷaikāl*, etc. the words like *ceykinra* may have been used along with singular nouns and later on may have been used to qualify all kinds of nouns. Dr. Caldwell thinks³ that 'a' is a possessive case sign; but I have already shown that the possessive case sign 'a' mentioned by Nannūlar may have evolved from 'a' the sign of the neuter plural in verbs.

3.2222242. *VINAI-Y-ECCAM*: *Vinai-y-eccam* corresponds to indeclinable past participles like Sanskrit *gatvā* and gerunds like the infinitive of purpose *gantum* in Sanskrit, and infinitive verbal forms denoting condition and cause, which are not found in Sanskrit.

The indeclinable past participles are of two kinds—the affirmative past participle and the negative past participle. The

1. *Ceykinra kaṇ*. (Pari. 163, 35.)

Iravāninra vaḷai. (K. 1157.)

2. *Ceykinrū*:—*cey* (root) + *ku* (cāriyai) + *iṇ* (cāriyai) + *rū* (neuter singular termination.)

3. C. D. G. 523.

affirmative indeclinable past participial forms are according to Tolkāppiyaṇār *ceytū*, *ceyyū* and *ceypū*. He does not mention the negative indeclinable past participial forms; but uses the form *kollātū* in Tol. Col. 198, and this form is frequently used in literature. (e.g.) *vāyil viṭātū kōyil puḱkēm* (we entered the palace without informing the gate-keeper) (P. N. 67. 10). According to Tolkāppiyaṇār, the forms that are gerunds are *ceyyiyar*, *ceyyiya*, *ceyarkū*, *ceytena* and *ceya*, and the form that is used as infinitive denoting condition is *ceyiṇ*.¹

CEYTŪ: This is formed, I think, by adding *tu* to the root *cey*. It denotes an action done previous to that which is denoted by the verb which it qualifies. (e.g.) *ceytū vantān*. It may be noted here that this suffix *tu* and the stem *tu* of the suffixes *tum*, *tvā* and *tavē* in *gantum gatvā* and *sartavē* of Vēdic Sanskrit are similar. In addition to the form *ceytū*, the forms *pōy* and *uraṇki* are used. Here *tu* is not added to the root, but *y* or *i* is added. If *i* happened to be the earlier suffix, it may be said that it was changed to *y* in the case of certain verbs. These forms *ceytū*, *uraṇki* and *pōy* have lived to the present day, unlike the forms *ceyyū* and *ceypū*.

CEYYŪ: Cēṇavaraiyar and Naccinārkkiniyar mention that this denotes an action done previous to that denoted by the verb finite or infinite which it qualifies.² (e.g.) *itai puṭaiyū . . . erri* (Pattu. 227. 376). But there are examples where it denotes an action more or less simultaneous with that denoted by the verb which it qualifies. Thus in the sentence ‘*tōl ōcci valaṇ vaḷaiyū-p-pakal makil tūṇkum*’ (Pattu. 136. 145.) which means ‘dancing at day time with the left shoulder bent towards the right’, the word *vaḷaiyū* qualifies the present participle *tūṇkum* and the action of bending denoted by it remains so long as the action of dancing denoted by *tūṇkum* remains. Hence it seems that Teyvaccilaiyar has mentioned that this form *ceyyū* may

1. *Ceytū ceyyū-c ceypū ceytena-c*
Ceyiyar ceyyiya ceyiṇ-ceya-c ceyarkenā
A-v-vakai y-onpatum viṇai-y-eñcu kiḷavi.

(Tol. Col. 228.)

2. *Ukāram unṇūvantān, tinṇū-vantān enaṭ*
Piṇ-varum tolirku itai-y-iṇri mun-varum
Toliṇ-mēl iranta-kālam pōrri varum.

(Tol. Col. 228. Cēṇā.)

denote an action simultaneous with that of the word which it qualifies.¹ This form *ceyyū* sometimes changes to *ceyyā*.²

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam says that this corresponds to the form *kāram* in Sanskrit where the *ṇamulpratyaya* is added to the root.³ There is no purpose served by taking it so. This has almost given place to the form *ceyyā* even in the ancient period. (e.g.) *katavu eṇiyā civanturāy* (P. N. 4. 10).

CEYPŪ : Cēnāvaraiyar thinks that this denotes an action simultaneous with that which is denoted by the word which it qualifies. Teyvaccilaiyār and Nacciṇārkkiniyar quote one and the same sentence '*pularā-p-paccilai-y-iṭai-y-uṭupū toṭutta*' where the action denoted by *uṭupū* is previous to that denoted by *toṭutta* and hence think that the form *ceypū* may also denote an action previous to that denoted by the verb which it qualifies. This agrees with the use of the word '*teripū*' in *teripū-vēru kiḷattal* (Tol. Col. 49) by Tolkāppiyaṇār himself. This like *ceyyū*, is practically extinct.

The form *CEYYĀTŪ* evidently denotes the absence of an action that should have been done before that denoted by the verb which it qualifies. (e.g.) *nirayaṇ koḷpavarotū onṇātū* *ōmpu mati* (P. N. 5, 6 & 7). The form *ceyyāmai* is used in the same sense by Tolkāppiyaṇār in the sūtra

Aṭai-ciṇai mutal-eṇa murai-mūṇru mayaiṇkāmai

Naṭai-per riyaḷum vaṇṇa-c ciṇai-c-col. (Tol. Col. 26.)

In addition to them the form *ceyyāmal* is found in Sangam works. (e.g.) *tīrāmar kāppatōr tīraṇuṇṭēl* (Ka. T. Vol. 1, 287. 13.): *ceyyāmar ceṭta-v-utavi* (K. 101). The latter form is more frequently used in modern days than the former.

What could have been its origin? I venture to suggest the following explanation.

From the frequent use of compound forms like *celvēṁ allēṁ* (P. N. 31. 11.), *tolutaṇam allamō* (P. N. 60. 6.) in old Tamil literature, it may not be unreasonable to suppose that a compound formation of the type of *kāṇām allām* was also current beside the forms *kāṇēṁ allēṁ*, and *kāṇvaṇam allam*. Now it is

1. *Ceyyū-eṇpatū iṇanta-kālamum nikal-kālamum kāṭṭum.*
(Tol. Col. 228, Tey.)
2. *Ceyyā v-eṇṇum viṇai-y-eṇcu kiḷaviyum.* (Tol. E. 223.)
3. *Ceyyā-c ceyyū-c ceypu-v-e ṇ-eccaṇ*
Kamuñ-ē ṇamul-ē yaṇ-p-eṇa lākum. (P. V. 38, Comm.)

easy to see how an extended form like *kāṇāmal* representing the negative indeclinable participle may have sprung up, by the line of separation being erroneously drawn between *kāṇāmal* and *ām*. In all probability, the form *kāṇāmal* which arose in this manner may have been used first in association with a verb of the first person plural and subsequently may have acquired an extended use in association with other persons and numbers also. Then the forms like *ceyyāmal* may have sprung up. The form *ceyyāmē*¹ is also found in use.

GERUNDS: CEYYIYAR AND CEYYIYA: These mean exactly 'for the purpose of doing'. Hence they qualify a word which denotes an action previous to that denoted by itself. These two are practically extinct now. It is worth noting that the gerunds *ceyyiyar* and *ceyyiya* are similar in form to that of the finite verbs in the optative mood. cf. *nī vāliyar* (P.N. 137.14); *vāliya nī* (Ka. T. Vol. 2.583.21).

CEYARKŪ: This conveys the same sense as *ceyyiyar* and *ceyyiya*. In form it appears to be the fourth case of the verbal noun *ceyal*. It is similar to the form *sartavē* in Vedic Sanskrit since both the forms are dative. Examples like *vararkū* (to come) (P. N. 64. 7), *valañceyarkū* (to go round in clock-wise directing) (P. N. 6. 18) are very frequent in literary works. But in modern times the form *ceyvatarckū* is more frequently used than the form *ceyarkū*.

CEYA: This conveys the same meaning as *ceyyiyar*, *ceyyiya* and *ceyarkū*, when it qualifies a finite verb, a participle, indeclinable past participle or another gerund. This is sometimes used as an absolute. In examples like *maḷai peyya, kuḷam niraṇṭatū*, (rain falling, the tank became full) the gerund *peyya* denotes an action previous to that denoted by the verb *niraṇṭatū* which follows it; and in examples like *ñāyiru paṭa, avan vantān*, (the sun setting, he came) the gerund *paṭa* denotes an action simultaneous with that denoted by the verb *vantān* which follows it: It may also denote an action subsequent to that denoted by the verb which it qualifies (e.g.) *makkaḷ cukamāy irukka tantai paṇaṇ cērttān*. (The father amassed wealth so that his children may live happily.) This form has lived to the present day. Sometimes, the form *ceyya* takes its place.

1. *Añcana vaṇṇaṇ-en n-ār-uyir nāyaka n-ālāmē*

(my dear life-giver, blue in colour as collyrium, not ruling.) (Kampar. kuka. 14.)

CEYIN: This means 'if you do'. A similar infinitive form is not found in Sanskrit. This form *ceyin* is frequently used in the works of the Sangam period. (e.g.) *paricil nalkuvaiyāyin* (if you give presents) (P. N. 116. 5). This may be taken as an ablative infinitive. It is similar in form to the ablative infinitive *gantōh* in Vēdic Sanskrit, though they differ in sense. The form is gradually giving place to the form *ceytāl* which is evidently a third case formed from the stem *ceyti*. (e.g.) *eṇṇiyiruntāl* (if you have thought) (Kampar. A. 276. 88.)

In the ancient period the negative form corresponding to *ceyin* is *ceyinallāl*. (e.g.) *nin kaṇ perinallāl* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 524. 8). In modern days the forms *ceyyāviṭin* and *ceyyāviṭtāl* are used instead.

CEYTENA: This form is generally used as an absolute, though there are instances like *viluttakai perukeṇa vēṇṭutum* (Pari. 93. 117) where it is used like other gerunds. It generally denotes the cause of the action denoted by the verb which follows it. e.g. *putuppeyal polintena kōvalar . . . vēru pulam parappi* (Since there were new showers, shepherds having gone to new lands (Pattu. 323, 2 to 4) and hence it should invariably denote an action previous to that denoted by the verb which follows it. This form has almost died out.

In addition to the above forms, Tolkāppiyaṇār has mentioned the forms *ceytaṇin*, *ceytamun*, *ceytakkāl*, *ceyvali*, *ceyyiṭam*, etc., which end in the words *ṇin*, *mun*, etc. which denote time.

Besides, the form *ceyinum* is used in the literature of the ancient period in the sense 'though one does'. (e.g.) *nī vēṇṭinum* (though you want) (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 576, 20). This is evidently formed from *ceyin* by the addition of the particle *um*. This is to a certain extent parallel to the form *kṛtvāpi* (*kṛtvā + api*) in Sanskrit.

The author of the Vīracōliyam mentions that the particles *poruṭṭu*, *ka*, *pān*, *taṇkū*, *vān* and *a* are added after roots to give the sense of *tumanta* (i.e.) gerunds.¹ The examples for the

1. *Manṇum* tumantam poruṭṭu-k-ka-p-pān-taṇkū vān-a-v-enṇu
Panṇum-elir-rātū vin-ṇin-pil-ākum pakaril-munṇu
Tunṇiya tātu-t taṇ-ṇin-poruttāka v-enṇun-totarcci
Unṇiya-pōtenṇu teyva-p-pulava r-uraittaṇarē.

(V. Tāt. 8.)

same are found in the commentary under the same stanza:— They are *uṇṇutarporuṭṭu vantān* (he came to eat), *kaṛka tārpariyattān* (he intended to read), *paṭiṭṭpān vantān* (he came to read), *pōtarṅkū ninaintān* (he thought to go), *aṛivān karuttuṇṭū* (he desired to know), *uṇṇa vallan* (he is able to eat). Here it is evident that the forms *uṇṇutarporuṭṭu* and *pōtarṅkū* are respectively the fourth case of the verbal nouns *uṇṇutal* and *pōtal*. The forms *kaṛka* and *uṇṇa* come under the same category as *ceya* mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṇār. In the case of *paṭiṭṭpān* and *aṛivan* in the sentences '*paṭiṭṭpān vantān*' and '*aṛivān karuttuṇṭū*', they may have been originally finite verbs and were later on taken as gerunds.

How this happened may thus be explained. Tolkāppiyaṇār recognises the use of a number of finite verbs without conjunctive particles, in syntactic agreement with the same subject.¹ It does not require much effort to see that collocations of this kind—*puttiyānai vantatu kāṇpān yān taṅkiṇēn* (I stayed to see the new elephant) (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 592, 7), *collinān . . . tērruvān* (Kampar. A. 213, 16), *paṇam cērṭṭpān paṭiṭṭpān varuvān* (he came to read so that he might earn money) (Colloq.)—may have led to forms like *kāṇpān*, *cērṭṭpān*, *paṭiṭṭpān*, being taken as gerunds in the sense of *cērṅka* and *paṭiṅka*.

Similarly he says that the particles *ā*, *ittu*, *tu*, *u* and *i* are added to roots to convey the sense of *tvānta*.² The examples for the same are, as given in the commentary, *uṇṇā-p-pōṇān*, *uṇṭiṭṭu-p-pōṇān*, *uṇṭu-pōṇān*, *pukuntu-pōṇān*, *pukku-p-pōṇān*, and *colli-ninṇān*. Of these *a*, *tu* and *i* have already been mentioned. The particle *ittu* is evidently the indeclinable past participle of the root *iṭu* and it seems to have been used in the colloquial speech at the time of the author of the *Vīracōḷiyam* as a particle giving the sense of *tvānta*. The form *pukku* may have originally been *pukkū* and *ū* may have been shortened to *u*.

The author of the *Nēminātam* has omitted the forms *ceyyiyar* and *ceyyū* mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṇār, since such forms may

1. *Avaitām*

Tattaṅ kilavi y-aṭukkuna varinnum

Ettirat tānum peyar-muṭi piṇavē. (Tol. Col, 429.)

2. *Ā-v-um-iṭṭu-n-tu-v-v-u-m-i-v-v-iṇoṭiyyu m-arum-pulavar*

Ēruṅ-karuttā v-iru-toḷir k-onṇiṭin munpu-ninṇū

Mēvum-poruṭ-tātu viṇ-piṇ-varu-mikka taṅ-peyarē

Pāvum-tuvāntam-a tām-enṇuraippar paṇi-moḷiyē.

(V. Tāt. 9.)

have gone out of use in his time, incorporated the forms ending in *ā* and *pān* mentioned by the author of the *Vīracōliyam* and has added another form ending in *pākkū*.¹

The author of *Nannūl* has mentioned all the forms noted by *Tolkāppiyaṇār* except *ceyarḱū* and adopted the forms ending in *ā*, *vān* and *pān* from the author of the *Vīracōliyam* and the forms ending in *pākkū* from the author of the *Nēminātam*.²

Cēnāvaraiyar in his commentary under *Tol. Col. 229* mentions the form ending in *pākkū* and also other forms ending in *āl* as *ceytāl* and *mal* as *ceyyāmal* (negative), etc. (e.g.) *onru kuraipaṭāmal* (*Cilap. 57. 9.*)

Nacciṇārkkiniyar in his commentary under the same *sūtra* adds a form ending in *vākkū*.

The author of the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* repeats what has been said by the author of the *Nannūl*.³

WHAT IS THE PROBABLE ORIGIN OF THE FORMS ENDING IN *PĀKKŪ* AND *VĀKKŪ*? There are three instances where the suffix *pākkū* is used in the *Kural*. They are found in the *Kural*, 136, 164 and 1312. In the first two, the word *paṭupākkū* appears and in the last, *enpākkū*. From the context they mean only *paṭutal* and *ennutal*. *Pākkū*, here, may be understood as a suffix added to a root to form a verbal noun denoting the action alone. Thus a form like *paṭupākkū* may be analysed into the root *paṭu*, the formative suffix *pu* and *ākkū* the noun form of the root *ākū*. But the forms ending in *pākkū* and *vākkū* mentioned by the authors of the *Nēminātam* and the *Nannūl* and *Nacciṇārkkiniyar* are gerunds. *Nacciṇārkkiniyar* quotes a sentence '*puṇar-taru-cevan-taru-pākkū-c-cenṛān*' as an example of the gerund ending in *pākkū* and quotes a colloquial expression '*koḷvākkū vantān*' as an example of the gerund ending in *vākkū*. They are very rarely used in literature. What could have been their origin?

1. *Ceytū ceya-c-c-ceyyā-c ceyyiya ceytena-c*
Ceypū ceyin-ceyar keṇpaṇavum-moy-kuḷalāy
Piṇ-mun-pān pākkum pīravum viṇai-y-ecca-c
Coṇ-mun vakuttōr tuṇivu. (N. N. Col. 43.)

2. *Ceytū ceypū ceyyā-c ceyyū-c*
Ceytena-c ceya-c ceyin ceyyiya ceyyiyar
Vān-pān pākkina viṇai-y-eccam pīra
Ainton r-ārum mukkālam-um murai-tarum. (Na. 343.)

3. (I. V. 246.) See fn, 2 *supra*.

Uṇṇākkū and *koḷvākkū* may have arisen through haplology as crippled forms of *uṇṇākkukkū* and *koḷvākkukkū*, the dative singular of *uṇṇakkū* and *koḷvakkū*.

The author of the *Pirayōkavivēkam* has mentioned only the forms *ceyya*, *ceyyu*, *ceyṇu*, *ceyiṇ*, *ceytāl*, *ceytū* and *ceya* and coins the following sūtras to make these forms correspond to those in Sanskrit:—‘*ceyyā-c-ceyyū-c-ceyṇu veneccaṇ-kamuñē, ṇamulē yaṇ-ṇēnal ākum*’ ‘*eṇaven eccam itiyēnal ākum*’ ‘*ceyiṇ ceytāleṇa-c-ceyṇum iraṇṭiṇai iticēt teṇṇar aṇinticinōrē*’. These mean that the forms *ceyya*, *ceyyu* and *ceyṇu* respectively correspond to the forms in Sanskrit ending in *khamuñ* (e.g. *cauraṇ kāram* in *cauraṇkāram ākrōśati*), *ṇamul* (e.g. *smāram smāram*) and *yaṇ* (e.g. *aragamyā*); the form *ceyṇa* corresponds to *kṛtvā iti*; the forms *ceyiṇ* and *ceytāl* correspond to *karōti cēt*. He also mentions that the form *ceytū* corresponds to *kṛtvā* and *ceya* to *kartum*. Since no useful purpose is served by these sūtras of correspondence, I think they are unnecessary in a treatise on Tamil grammar.

In colloquial speech only the form *ceytū* remains for the indeclinable past participle, the forms *ceya* and *ceytaṇkū* for the gerund, *ceyiṇ* and *ceytāl* to denote condition and *ceytālum* and *ceyiṇum* to denote contrast in the affirmative; and in the negative voice *ceyyāmal* (e.g. *kuṇaiṇāmal* (Cilap. 57. 9) for the indeclinable past participle, *ceyyāmal iruṇṇataṇkū* for the gerund and *ceyyāmal iruntāl* and *ceyyāmal iruntālum* to denote condition and contrast respectively. The presence of many forms for the gerund in the affirmative in the ancient Tamil and only a few in the modern period reminds one of the similar process of change in the history of Sanskrit infinitives.

3.23. *ITAI-C-COL*: 3.231. *DEFINITION*: *Tolkāppiyaṇār* mentions in the sūtras

Itai-y-eṇa-ṇ paṭuva peyaroṭum viṇai-y-oṭum
Natai-ṇer r-iyalum tamakkiyal ṇ-ilavē. (Tol. Col. 249.)
Avaitām
Munnum pinṇu moḷi-y-aṭuttu varutalum
Tam-m-irū tiritalum piṇitava ṇilaiyalum
Anṇavai y-ellā m-uriya v-eṇṇa. (ibid. 251.)
Avaitām
Puṇariya ṇilai-y-itai-ṇ poruṇilai-k-kutanavum
Viṇai-ceyaṇ maruṇkir kalamoṭu varunavum

Vērrumai-ṭ poruḷ-vayi n-urupā kunavum
Acai-nilai-k kiḷavi y-āki varunavum
Icai-nirai-k-kiḷavi y-āki varunavum
Tattaiṅ kuripṭu poruḷ-cey kunavum
Oppil valiyār poruḷ-cey kunavum-enṛu
A-ṭ-ṭaṅ piṇavē nuvaluṅ kālai. (ibid. 250.)

that *iṭai-c-col* has no separate existence of its own, it is used along with nouns and verbs either as a part of them or before or after them and consists of the flexional increments, personal terminations of verbs, case-suffixes, particles added for the sake of euphony or for making up the quantity of verse, particles of conjunction and interjection, and those denoting comparison, etc. From this it is clear that *iṭai-c-col* in Tamil corresponds to *pratyayas* and *nipātas* in Sanskrit. The author of the *Nēminātam* repeats the idea contained in Tol. Col. 250 only.¹ The author of the *Nannūl* summarises in one sūtra² all that is said by Tol-kāppiyanār, in the three sūtras mentioned above. The author of the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam*³ and the *Tonnūlviḷakkam*⁴ more or less repeat what is said by *Nannūlār*. All the commentators of the *Tolkāppiyam* and the later grammarians think that Tol. Col. 249 deals with the definition of *iṭai-c-col*.

But it seems to me that Tolkāppiyanār did not intend either Tol. Col. 249 or all the three sūtras Tol. Col. 249, 251 and 250 for the purpose of defining *iṭai-c-col*; for, the most important feature of *iṭai-c-col* is that it is a *pratyaya* or formative element or a *nipāta*. This is suggested by the name *iṭai-c-col* which

1. *Cāriyai-y-ā y-onra l-urupāta raṅ-kurippin*
Erum poruḷ-āta ninṛicai-y-āy-ṭ-ṭērtal
Viṇai-c-coṅkīr rāta l-icai-niraittu mēval
Anaittē y-iṭai-c-co l-aḷavu. (N. N. Col. 50.)
2. *Vērrumāi viṇai cāriyai oppu urupukaḷ*
Tattam poruḷa icai-nirai acai-nilai
Kurippe n-en-ṭakutiyyin tanittiya l-inri-ṭ
Peyarinum vinaiyinum piṇ-muṅ ōritattū
Onrum palavum van tonruva t-iṭai-c-col. (Na. 420.)
3. *Vērrumai viṇai-cā riyai-y-ṭ purupukaḷ*
Tattam poruḷa v-icāi-nirai y-acai-nilai
I-t-tira m-ēlir ranittiya l-inri-ṭ
Peyarinum vinaiyinum piṇ-muṅ n-ōr-itattū
Onrum palavūm-van tonruva t-iṭaiccol. (I. V. 251.)
4. T. V. 130.

means 'the side word'. That this is his idea is well seen from the sūtra

Iṭai-c-col l-ellām vērrumai-c collē. (Tol. Col. 455.)

where he says that every *iṭai-c-col* is *vērrumai-c-col*. Here *vērrumai-c-col* evidently means differentiating element, i. e. an element which differentiates the relation between the governing base or word to which it is appended and the following verb. For instance the case-suffix *ai* in '*irāmanai*' specifically defines the character of *raṃan*'s relation to the following verb as its object, since the stem *irāman*, by itself, admits of several kinds of relation such as the subject, instrument, recipient, etc. Similarly *ā* in *vantānā* makes the assertive verb *vantān* an interrogative verb and so on.

Having suggested that *iṭai-c-col* is a formative element or a *nipāta*, Tolkāppiyāṇār says in Tol. Col. 249 and 251 that it does not possess a separate existence, but is used as a part of nouns or verbs or before or after either of them. He then enumerates them in detail in Tol. Col. 250.

3.232. IS *IṬAI-C-COL VĀCAKA* OR *DYŌTAKA*? Cēṇā-varaiyar and Teyvaccilaiyār mention in their commentary on Tol. Col. 249 that the word '*tamakkīyalpila*' suggests that *iṭai-c-col* is not a *vācaka* but only *dyōtaka*, i. e. it does not have a meaning of its own, but only suggests that the noun or verb which it accompanies has a particular meaning. They have said so, I think, in imitation of a class of Sanskrit grammarians who hold that *upasargas* or prepositions and the case suffixes in Sanskrit are *dyōtaka* and not *vācaka*. For instance in *upakarōti* the element *upa* does not have any meaning of its own, but suggests that the root *kṛ* in *upakarōti* means to help, though it can have other meanings elsewhere. Similarly, the case suffixes suggest that the base is an object to a verb, recipient, etc.

But I think that this is not quite consistent with the definition given by Tolkāppiyāṇār that *col* is that which has a meaning.¹ I have already said in 3.1 supra that Tolkāppiyāṇār seems to follow the opinion of the Sanskrit logicians. According to the latter even the *pratyayas* are *vācaka*. Besides, even those Sanskrit grammarians who think that *upasargas* and case suffixes are

1. *Ellā-c collum poruḷ-kurit taṇa-v-ē.* (Tol. Col. 155).

dyōtaka take the verbal terminations to be *vācaka* and not *dyōtaka*.

If that be so, one may ask what the importance of the word '*tamakkialpila*' in the sūtra Tol. Col. 249 is. It evidently suggests that *iṭai-c-col* does not have a separate existence of its own outside nouns or verbs or the sentence made up of nouns or verbs.

3.233. *PARALLELS*: The sentence '*iṭai-y-eṇaṭṭaṭuva peyaroṭum viṇaiyoṭum naṭaiṭṭerriyalum*' in Tol. Col. 249 seems to find a parallel in '*uṣasargā viṃśatirarthavācakāḥ sahētarābhyām* (R. V. P. 12.6). Here one may point out that the latter deals only with *uṣasarga*, while the former deals with *ṭṛatyayas* and all *nipātas*. But the expression '*sahētarābhyām*' is so beautifully translated by Tolkāppiyaṇār into '*peyaroṭum viṇaiyoṭum*' that it may apply to all *ṭṛatyayas* and *nipātas*.

Besides it seems to me that Tolkāppiyaṇār in giving a list of *iṭai-c-col* with their meanings in *iṭai-y-iyal* may have had for his model the first chapter of Yāska's Nirukta where Yāska deals with *nipātas*. The following parallels may be noted:—

1. *ciraṭṭoṭu* . . . *ōkārammē* (which means the particle *ō* is used to denote superiority.) Tol. Col. 256:
cit . . . *ṭṛājāyām* (Y. N. 33.12.) (*ṭṛājā*=*ciraṭṭu*.)
2. *ṭṛinilai* . . . *ōkārammē* (which means the particle *ō* is used in *ṭṛinilai*.) Tol. Col. 256:
aha iti ca ha iti ca vinigrahārthīyāu (Y. N. 37.2.)
(vinigraha=*ṭṛinilai*.)
3. *antil āṇka-v-acainilai-k-kiṭavi* (which means that the words *antil*, *āṇka* are used simply to make up the quantity of the verse.) Tol. Col. 267:
athāpi ṭṛaṭṭuraṇā idamu tadu (Y. N. 37.4) (*ṭṛaṭṭuraṇa*=*acainilai-k-kiṭavi*.)

3.234. Prepositions in Tamil are very rare. That which approximates to it in early literature is *koṇ* in *koṇṇūr*. *Koṇṇūr* is mentioned by the author of the Pirayōkavivēkam as a compound having the *nipāta koṇ* as the first member.¹ It may be said to be similar in form to *uṣagrāmam* in Sanskrit. In the later periods the nouns like *kai* in *iṭaiyiliyāka-k-kai-k-koṇṭu* (S. I. I. iii, i, 44.6), *ṭṛam* in *ṭṛaṇ-koṭuttāṇ* are considered as prepositions. (c. f. P. V. 45, comm.)

1. '*Koṇṇūr*' *eṇa avviyaya-ṭṛurva-ṭṛaṭam-āy vanta avviyayī-ṭṛavam-ākiya muṇ-moli-y-iṭai-c-col varum*. (P.V. 23 comm.)

3.24. URI-C-COL: 3.241. DEFINITION: Tolkāppiyānār mentions in the sūtra

Uri-c-cor kilavi virikkuṇ kālai
Icai-y-inuṇ kurippinūm paṇṇinūn tōnri-p
Peyarinūm vinaiyinu mey-taṭu māri
Oru-cor pala-poruṭ k-urimai tōnriinūm
Pala-col l-oruṇoruṭ k-urimai tōnriinūm
Payilāta varrai-p payinravai cārtti-t
Tatta maraṇṇir cenru-nilai maruṇkiṇ
E-c-col l-āyinūm poruṭ vēru-kilattal. (Tol. Col. 297.)

that *uri-c-col* in its detailed significance denotes *icai*, *kurippu* and *paṇṇu*. Its form undergoes modification in nouns and verbs. It may have many meanings or it may have the same meaning as others of its kind and it is to be explained in literature by means of words ordinarily current in the world.

All the commentators of the Tolkāppiyam mistake that this sūtra defines *uri-c-col*. Cēnāvaraiyar feeling that the statement 'that it has many meanings, etc.' is out of place in the sūtra dealing with definition, says that though the author states that it is used in nouns and verbs with its form modified, etc., it should be defined as that which denotes *icai*, *kurippu* and *paṇṇu*.¹ Teyva-ccilaiyār says that, since Tolkāppiyānār has mentioned *uri-c-col* as *kuraiccorkilavi* in *Eluttatikāram*, it is identical with *dhātu* in Sanskrit.²

The author of the Nēminātam summarises Tol. Col. 297 in N. N. Col. 56. The author of the Naṇṇūl defines that *uri-c-col* is that which is exclusively used in poetry, which cannot be separated from nouns and verbs and which denotes one *kuṇam* or quality or many qualities.³ The author of the Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam reproduces the idea contained in Tol. Col. 297 with the modification that it

1. *Mey-taṭu-māralum oru-cor pala-poruṭ-kuri-mai-y-um, pala-col oru-poruṭ-kurimaiyum uri-c-corkū unmaiyaṇ oṭinārēnum, uri-c-corkū ilakkaṇam-āvatu icai kurippu-p paṇṇennum poruṭ-kuriyavāy varutalēyām.* (Tol. Col. 297, cena.)

2. *Eluttatikārattul itanai kurai-c-cor-kilavi enru oṭinamaiyāl, vaṭanūl-āciriyaṇ tāṭu enru kuri-y-iṭṭa corkalē ivai-y-enru kollappaṭum.* (Tol. col. 292, Teyva.)

3. *Pal-vakai-p paṇṇum pakar-peya r-āki*
Oru-kuṇam pala-kuṇan taluvi-p peyar-vinai
Oruvā ceyyutkū uriyaṇa uri-c-col. (Na. 442).

is used either as *vinai-p-pōli* (verb in imitation) and *peyar-p-pōli* (noun in imitation) or as the base of nouns or verbs and mentions in his commentary on the same that *karuppu*, *civappu* are *peyar-p-pōli* and *uru*, *tava* are *vinai-p-pōli* in the same way as Cēnāvaraiyar has done under Tol. Col. 297. Besides, he states that there are some Tamil grammarians who hold that *uri-c-col* is mostly found in poetry.

It seems to me that Tol. Col. 297 does not deal with the definition of *uri-c-col*. If it deals with it, all the lines except the first two are out of place, as is suggested by Cēnāvaraiyar. Its definition is suggested by the name *uri-c-col*. *Uri-c-col* does not mean the word belonging to only poetry as Nannūlār thinks, nor the word denoting quality belonging to objects as Cēnāvaraiyar and others think. It means the word denoting the independent part of a noun or verb; for the word *urimai* means 'right' and hence independence. Its nature in form is clearly expressed in the sūtra—

Eluttu-p-pirin ticaitta l-ivaṇiyal p-inrē. (Tol. Col. 395.) which may be translated thus:—'It is not in its nature capable of being further analysed'. This and the word *kūrai-c-coṟkiḷavi* mentioned in the last but one sūtra of *Eluttatikāram* clearly suggest that *uri-c-col* is the root of nouns or verbs. It cannot be taken to be identical with Sanskrit *dhātu* as mentioned by Teyvaccilaiyār since *dhātu* is, according to the Sanskrit Grammarians, a verbal root and since Tolkāppiyaṇār has not suggested anywhere in his work that all nouns are derived from verbal roots. Teyvaccilaiyār seems to have said so thinking that Tolkāppiyaṇār follows the theory of Śākaṭāyana and Nāiruktas that all nouns are derived from verbal roots.¹ But it seems to me that he follows the theory of Gārgya and another section of Sanskrit grammarians who hold that it is not necessary that all nouns should have been derived from verbal roots.² The chief reason for the latter view is that neither Tolkāppiyaṇār nor the later grammarians have attempted to derive all nouns from verbal roots. Hence *uri-c-col* may be taken as the nominal or verbal root.

1. *Tatra nāmāni ākhyātajānīti Śākaṭāyanō nairukta-samayaś ca.* (Y.N. 56, 2.)

2. *Na sarvāṇi ity eva gārgyo vaiyākaraṇānāṇ caīke.* (Y. N. 56, 3.)

3.242. *NATURE OF URI-C-COL*: If so, what is the purpose served by Tol. Col. 297? I may say that it explains it. The part '*icaiyinuṁ kuṛippinuṁ paṇṇinuṁ tōṇṇi*' means 'used to denote *icai* (sound) *kuṛippu* (feeling) and *paṇṇu* (*jāti*=genus *guṇa*=quality or *kriyā*'=action)'. The part '*orucol paḷaḥoruṭ kurimai tōṇṇinuṁ*' means 'though the same root can have different meanings'. The part '*paḷacol oruḥoruṭ kurimai tōṇṇinuṁ*' means 'though different roots are used in same sense'. The part '*payilātavarrai payinṇavai cārtti . . . kiḷattal*' means 'one should explain the meaning of the root which is not current by one which is current'.

3.243. *URI-Y-IYAL IN TOLKĀPPIYAM AND YĀSKA'S NIRUKTA*: A close examination of the first sūtra in this section (*uri-y-iyal*) and those that follow, and the second, third and fourth chapters of Yāska's Nirukta shows that Tolkāppiyāṇār may have had Nirukta for his model. The portion '*orucol paḷaḥoruṭ kurimai tōṇṇinuṁ*' has a parallel in '*ēkārtham anēkaśabdām ityētaduktam* (Y. N. 265.1)'. The portion '*paḷacol oruḥoruṭ kurimai tōṇṇinuṁ*' has a parallel in '*atha yānyanēkārthāni ēkaśabdāni tānyatō anukramiṣyāmaḥ* (Y. N. 266.2)'. The expression '*payilātavarrai*' has a parallel in '*anavagatasamskārān ca nigamān* (Y. N. 266.3). The expression '*veḷiḥpaṭu collē*' has a parallel in '*saṁvijñātāni tāni*' in the sentence '*tadyatra svāra saṁskārāu samarthau prādeśikena guṇena anvitāu syātām saṁvijñātāni tāni*' (Y. N. 56.4).

The list of *uri-c-col* given by Tolkāppiyāṇār may be divided into that which deals with verbal roots and that which deals with nominal roots. For instance, the words *vārtal*, *ḥōkal*, *tīrttal* etc., in Tol. Col. 317 & 318 denotes only the verbal roots *vār*, *ḥō*, *tīr* exactly in the same way as *āvayati*, *bhavati*, *vēti*, etc. given in Y.N. page 195, *rēlatē*, *hēlatē*, etc., in page 197 of the same, etc. The words *vilumam*, *cīrmai*, *karuvi* mentioned in Tol. Col. 353 and 354 are similar to *mahat*, *budhnaḥ*, etc. given in Y. N. page 213. But at the same time, it should be borne in mind that Tolkāppiyāṇār does not seem to have incorporated in Tamil grammar the theory of the Nāiruktas that all nouns are derived from verbal roots.

It may be interesting to note that the Tamil word *uru* found in the sūtra '*uru tava nāni . . . mikuti ceyyum ḥoruḷa*' (Tol. Col.

299) and the Sanskrit word *uru* in '*uru tuvi puru . . . iti dvādaśa bahunāmāni* (Y.N. 212.1) both head the list of words having the sense 'much'. The Tamil grammarians have not been 'able to satisfactorily explain the derivation of the Tamil '*uru*' and the Tamil '*tava*' in the sense of 'much'. But a consideration of the Nirukta parallel indicated above (*uru tuvi . .*) might help any one in equating the Tamil *uru* and *tava* in the sense of 'much' with Sanskrit *uru* and *tuvi* in the same sense, and in appreciating the correspondence between the two sets of words both on the phonological and semantic sides. The way in which Tolkāppiyaṇār frames a list of words whose derivation cannot be ascertained—such as *nani*, *kaṭi*—is very similar to the manner in which Yāska frames a list of *asamvijñāta* words like *jahā*, *nidhā*, etc. in pp. 267 and 269 of the Nirukta.

Besides, Tolkāppiyaṇār first gives the list of roots which have the same meaning and then only roots which have different meanings. In Nirukta too, list of words having the same meaning is given in the second and third chapters and the list of those having different meanings is given in the fourth and fifth chapters.

On considering the above points, it may be clear that Tol. Col. 294 does not deal with the definition of *Uri-c-col*. The statement of Naṇṇūlār that it is used only in poetry was made on account of the mistaken notion that only the words like *uru*, *tava*, *nani*, etc. whose derivation is believed to be obscure are *uri-c-col*. He seems to have failed to note the sūtra '*veḷippaṭu collē kiḷattal vēṇṭā, veḷippaṭa vārā uricconmēṇa*' (Tol. Col. 298) which means that the *uri-c-col* which are in use are not mentioned here and only those which are not in use, are mentioned.

I really wonder how Cēṇāvaraiyar and the author of *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* countenance the opinion of Naṇṇūlār that *uri-c-col* is found only in poetry as an alternative theory. The reason for this, it seems to me, is that they may have mistaken *vilumam*, *cīrmai*, etc. mentioned in Tol. Col. 353 for noun forms, since they say that *karuppu*, *civappu*, etc. are *peyar-p-pōli* while such forms evidently represent nominal roots as explained above.

From the above arguments one can very well see that it would not be correct to say that all words are *uri-c-col*, as the

author of the Pirayōkavivēkam has said in one place (P. V, 18, comm. p. 31.) or to include it in *iṭai-c-col* as the same grammarian has done in another place (P. V. 42, comm.); nor would it be correct to define *uri-c-col* as 'one of a few indeclinables which always have the force of adjective or adverb¹.

4. WORD-FORMATION AND COMPOUNDS.

4.1. *WORD-FORMATION*: It seems to me that according to Tolkāppiyāṇār that words, generally nouns and verbs, are formed by suffixing one or more *iṭai-c-col* to *uri-c-col*, as *kariyaṇ*, *kariyaḷ*, etc. or by suffixing *iṭai-c-col* to nouns or verbs as *valaiyaṇ*, *uṇṇēṇai*, etc.

The author of the Vīracōḷiyam, in imitation of Pāṇini's grammar, names the suffixes that are added to words as *taddhita* and gives their list in V. Tat. 1, 4 and 5. They are *aṇ*, *iyaṇ*, *īṇaṇ*, *ēyaṇ*, etc.; *mai*, *am*, *pu*, *tu*, *vu*, *kām*, etc.; and *acci*, *āṭṭi*, *aṇi*, *āṭṭi*, *āl*, *aḷ*, *i*, etc. The examples given by the commentator for the same are *valaiyaṇ*, *vētiyaṇ*, *kulīṇaṇ*, *vaiṇatēyaṇ*, etc.; *valimai*, *nilam*, *melip̄p̄u*, *valit̄u*, *melivu*, *kurukkam*, etc.; *paraicci*, *vellāṭṭi*, *pār̄p̄paṇi*, *vaṇṇāṭṭi*, etc. Here an unnecessary mixing-up of Sanskrit *taddhita pratyayas* and Tamil *pratyayas* has been done; for instance, *īṇa* in *kulīṇa* and *ēya* in *vaiṇatēya* are Sanskrit *pratyayas*; the *pratyayas* given in V. Tat. 4 are strictly speaking *kṛt pratyayas*; but the author of the Vīracōḷiyam seems to take it that *valimai*, *kurukkam*, etc. are formed from the nouns *vali*, *куру*, etc., which, in his opinion, are formed from the roots *val*, *куру*, etc. But we do not find such verbal forms as *val* and *куру*. As regards the third list the same confusion made. The Sanskrit word *brāhmaṇastrī*, if Tamilised, becomes *pār̄p̄paṇatti* and *pār̄p̄paṇacci*. Hence *acci* and *atti* are not, strictly speaking, suffixes. The word *vaṇṇāṭṭi* is evidently formed from *vaṇṇāṇ + attu* (cāriyai) + *i*, where the *ṇ* of *vaṇṇāṇ* is dropped. Hence all the suffixes noted in V. Tat. 5 could be brought under *i*, *aḷ* and *āl*. Similarly he makes mention of *kṛt pratyayas* in V. Tat. 3 and 4.

He forms the nominative case of nouns by adding *cu* and then dropping it, in direct imitation of Pāṇini's grammar.

Nannūlar takes the forms *naṭa*, *vā*, etc. as the roots like the author of the *Viracōliyam*;¹ but does not agree that *cemmai*, *ciṟumai*, etc. are derived from verbs, but says that they are *pakāppatam* or indivisible words.

According to him, the case forms of nouns are framed by adding case-suffixes to nouns are participial nouns, e.g. *kaṇṇanai*, *pōnēnai*; *cāriyai* may be inserted before the case-suffix; the verbal forms are formed by adding the tense sign followed by the personal terminations to the roots in general.

All the later grammarians follow Nannūlar² except the author of the *Pirayōkavivēkam*, who follows the author of the *Viracōliyam*. The parallelism between V. Tat. 2 and 3 and P. V. 31 and 32 is striking. He divides *tattitaṇ* into three as *cāmāniya-tattitaṇ*, *avviyatattitaṇ*, and *pāvatattitaṇ*³, and enumerates them in P. V. 30 to 34. The difference between the author of the *Viracōliyam* and that of the *Pirayōkavivēkam* is that the latter does not mix the Tamil suffixes with Sanskrit suffixes though he imports the Sanskritic technical terms.

4.2. COMPOUNDS: 4.21. MEANING OF THE WORD 'TOKAI': The word that is chosen by Tolkāppiyaṇār to denote compounds is *tokai*. The word *tokai* is derived from the root 'toki' which means to elide and also to join together. Cēṇavaraiyar⁴ mentions that there are two schools of interpretation of

1. *Manniyā-cīr-vaṭa nūliṟ-cara-paca v-enṟū-vanti*
Tunniya-tātu-k kaḷin-pōli-pōla-t tokū-tamiḷkkum
Panniya-tātu-k kaḷai-p-pataittu-k-kolka munnilaiyin
Unniya-v-ēva l-orumai-c-cor-pōṇṟula kirkokkavē.
(V. Tāt. 1.)

2. *Naṭa-vā maṭi-cī viṭu-ku vē-vai*
No-p-pō vau-v-uri ṇuṇ-porun tirun-tiṇ
Tēy-pār celvav vāl-kē l-a:kenṟū
Innavai mutala v-ellā viṇaiyun
Terinilai viṇaiyin mutanilai y-ākum. (I. V. 43.)
Naṭa, vā, uṇ, tiṇ ittotaḷkattana viṇai-p-pakā-p-patam.
(ibid. 40, comm.)

3. *Cāmā niyam-av viyam-pāva mūṇṟena-t tattitaṇ-vēṟū*
(P. V. 30.)

4. *Vēṟṟumai-y-urupum uvama-v-urupum um-m-aiyum viṇai-*
c-col-l-īrum paṇpu-c-col-l-īrun tokutaḷiṟ rokai-y-āyina v-enpārum,
a-v-v-a-p-poraṇmēl iraṇṭum palarum-ākiya corkaḷ pīlavu-patātū
orrumai-p-pata-t tam-m-ul-iyaitaliṟ rokai-y-āyina v-enpārum-ena
irūtirattār āciriyaṟ. (Tol. Col. 412, Cēṇā.)

the word *tokai*; one adopts the first meaning of the root *tokū* and thinks that *tokai* is that where the case-suffixes, the particle *um*, the particles of comparison, the ending of *paṇṇu-p-peyar* and the ending of verbs are dropped and the other adopts the second meaning and thinks that *tokai* is that in which two or more words are joined together. He belongs to the latter school and condemns the former school for the following two reasons:— (1) According to their interpretation even the expressions *ceytāṇ poruḷ* and *iruntāṇ māṭattū* would become *tokai* since the case-suffixes *ai* and *kaṇ* have been respectively dropped after the words *poruḷ* and *māṭattū*. (2) Even those who hold the former theory cannot but accept the unitary nature of a compound. These two reasons cannot stand if *tokai* is taken to be that in which two or more words are joined together by dropping case-suffixes, etc. Besides, Tolkāppiyāṇār himself describes the unitary nature of compounds in the sūtra

Ellā-t tokai-y-u m-oru-con ṇaṭaiya. (Tol. Col. 420.)

and dropping of case-suffixes, etc., in the sūtra

Paṇṇu-toka varūuṇ kiḷavi y-āṇum

Ummāi tokka peyar-vayi ṇ-āṇum

Vērrumai tokka peyar-vayi ṇ-āṇum

Īrru-niṇ riyalu m-aṇmolī-t tokai-y-ē. (Tol. Col. 418.)

where he deals with *aṇmolittokai* or *bahuvrīhi* compound. Hence the choice of the word '*tokai*' shows the genius of Tolkāppiyāṇār. It may be very interesting to note here that the Sanskrit name '*samāsa*' also, while it explicitly refers to composition, also implicitly conveys the idea of curtailment as may be seen from the contrast between the Sanskrit words *vyāsa* and *samāsa*. The interpretation of the word *tokai* by Cēṇāvaraiyar and Teyvaccilaiyār is possibly based upon the obvious meaning of the word *samāsa* (composition). Though Teyvaccilaiyār gives this interpretation of *tokai* under Tol. Col. 412, he takes into consideration the other meaning also in the word *tokku* in *paṇṇu toka . . .* (Tol. Col. 418).

The author of the *Vīracōliyam*, though he takes *tokai* to correspond to the term *samāsa*, (composition) clearly mentions the elision of case-suffixes, etc. in the former member of the compound (V. T. 1). The author of the *Pirayōkavivēkam*, on the other hand, says that he agrees with Cēṇāvaraiyar and repeats the reasons assigned by him (P. V. 19, comm. p. 34).

more members, the members being connected with one another by 'and' and denoting persons, measures, numbers, weights etc., as *ṭuli-viṛ-keṇṭai* (tiger, bow and *keṇṭai* fish) etc. It corresponds to *dvandva* in Sanskrit. *Anmoli-t-tokai*¹ is the possessive compound, the members of which may stand to each other in any of the three relations—quality-noun relation, conjunctive relation, and case-relation. It corresponds to *bahuvrīhi* in Sanskrit.

It may be noted here that the *number* of compounds in Tamil agrees with that of *primary* compounds in Sanskrit and the names given to them in Tamil are more suggestive of their function than those in Sanskrit. These compounds are treated in syntax as though they are single words.²

The above classification of Tolkāppiyaṇār is fairly exhaustive; but such compounds as *karu-niṛam*, *cārai-ṭ-ṭāmpū*, where both the members are either qualities or names which denote the genus and species of the same object, are not taken into account; but Cēṇāvaraiyar explains in his commentary on the same sūtra that they too are *paṇṭu-t-tokai*, on the strength of the expression *eṇṇa-kilaviyum*, which means 'similar words', in the sūtra.

All the later grammarians, except the authors of the *Vīracōliyam* and the *Pirayōkavivēkam*, *i. e.*, the authors of the *Nēminātam*, the *Nannūl*, the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* and the *Ilakkaṇakottū* agree, as regards the classification of compounds, with Tolkāppiyaṇār. And Nannūlār tries to improve upon Tolkāppiyaṇār as regards the definition of *paṇṭu-t-tokai*³ so that it may apply to compounds like *karu-niṛam*, *cārai-ṭ-ṭāmpū* etc.

But the author of the *Vīracōliyam* saw that a large number of Sanskrit compounds like *anīti*, *anittiyam* etc., were freely used in Tamil and they, along with some Tamil compounds like *karu-niṛam*, *paṇṇiru-toṭi*, *teṇ-kilakkū*, could not be directly explained with the rules on compounds stated by Tolkāppiyaṇār. Hence he began to classify them exactly in the same way as is

-
1. *Paṇṭu toka-varūṇi kilavi y-āṇum*
Ummāi tokka peyar-vayi n-āṇum
Vērrumai tokka peyar-vayi n-āṇum
Irū-niṇ riyalu m-anmoli-t tokai-y-ē. (ibid. 418.)
 2. *Ellā-t tokai-y-u m-oru-con nātaiya.* (ibid. 420.)
 3. *Paṇṭai viḷakkum moli-tok kaṇavum*
Oru-porutku iru-peyar vantavum kuṇa-t-tokai. (Na. 365).

done in Sanskrit ; *tarṇpuruṭaṇ* (tatpuruṣa), *ṇala-nel* (bahuvrīhi), *kaṇmatārayam* (karmadhāraya), *tuṇviku* (dvigu), *tuṇvantuṇvam* (dvandva) and *avṇviyaṇṇāva* (avyayībhāva).¹ Some may say that he might have left out *avṇviyaṇṇāva* since examples for it are very rare; it is true, but such words as *yatākkiramam*, the tadbhava of Skt. *yathākrama*, are sometimes found and they have to be explained.

The most important point to be noted in the *Vīracōliyam*, as also in the *Pirayōkavivēkam* whose author closely follows that of the *Vīracōliyam* with some difference here and there, is that most of the stanzas found in the chapter dealing with compounds (*tokai-ṇ-paṭalam*), in both are exactly the translation of the *kārikas* on *samāsa* assigned to the authorship of Vararuci in Sanskrit. They are as follows:—

- (1) *Ṣōḍhā samāsāṇ saṇkṣēṇṇāt ēkatrimṣad-vidhāṇ ṇunaṇ |*
Tatrāṣṭadhā tatṇpuruṣaṇ saṇṇtadhā karma-dhārayaṇ ||
Saṇṇtadhā ca bahuvrīhiṇ dvigur-ābhāṣitō dvidhā |
Dvandvaś-catur-vidhō jñēyōavyayībhāvas-tridhā mataṇ ||
(Var. Kār.)

Tarṇpuruṭaṇ-ṇala neṇ-kaṇma tārayaṇ tāṇṇkiya-cīr
Nar-ṇuviku-t-tokai nāvār-tuṇvantuṇva nalla-teyva-c
Cor-ṇayaṇ-māntarka ṇ-avṇviyaṇṇāva m-itēṇṇru-tonmai
Karṇṇakam-ā-ṇ-ṇakarn tār-tokai-y-ārūṇ kaṇṇaṇṇkulaiyē.
(V. T. 2.)

Tarṇpuruṭaṇ-ṇuvi ku-ṇ-ṇala neṇ-karma tārayaṇōṭū
Urṇṇala vāṇṇēṭuṇ kaṭ-ṇacun tē-moli y-onṇṇōṭiyāy
Cor-ṇayi ṇ-avṇvi yayīṇṇāva m-ēṇnai-t tuṇvattaṇ-eṇa-k
Karṇṇavar kūṇruṇ camācaṇ-ka ṇē-toka-k kaṭṇṇalai-y-ē.
(P. V. 20.)

- (2) *Tatṇpuruṣō' ṣṭa-vidhō bhūt ṇrathamādi-vibhakti-naṇ-*
kṛtāir-bhēdāiṇ |
Sa caikavadbhāvyāṇṇēkavadbhāvīti dvidhā dviguṇ |
(Var. Kār.)

Eluvāy-mutal-eluvēṇṇumaiyōṭū m-eluntatāiyil
Valuvātalaṇṇaṇṇōṭeṭ t-āṇ-tarṇpuruṭaṇ vaṇṇar-tuṇviku
Taluvārnta-veṇmoli munṇṇāy-varuṇ tattita-ṇ-ṇoruṇ-mēl
Kuluvār-orumai y-opṇṇu-ṇ-ṇaṇmai y-opṇṇu-k-kurī-y-iraṇṇē-
(V. T. 3.)

- Taṟṟpuru ṭa-t-tokai vēṟṟumai y-eṭṭanuṭ cārnta naññu-c*
Cor-ṟoru ḷ-anmai marai-y-iṇmai kūttun tokai-t-tuviku
Murṟpata m-eṇ-ṟiṟ ṟalan-tattitārtta muṭi-ttumelūum
Paṟṟala v-ēkavar ṟāvi-y-a nēkavar ṟāvi-y-eṇṟē. (P. V. 21.)
- (3) *Saṭṭabhirākhyābhir-vā vikhyātō yas-savai bahuvrīhiḥ |*
Dvābhyām padābhyām bahubhiḥ padāir-vā
Saṅkhyābhidhāyyantyapadam dvayam vā |
Yasyābhavat-pūrvapadē sahaśca
Digantarāla-vyatihāralakṣmā|| (Var. Kār.)
Irumoli-ṟanmoli ṟiṇmoli y-eṇṇōṭ-irumoli-y-eṇ
Maruvum-vitiyā r-ilakkaṇamarṟai-c caka-mun-moli
Paravun-tikantarā ḷa-t-tokai-y-anna-ṟ ṟalanerṟokai
Viriyum-ōr-ēḷ-avai vēṟṟu-moli-ṟ ṟoruṇ-mel-l-iyalē. (V. T. 4.)
- Irumoli ṟan-moli ṟiṇ-moli y-eṇṇō ṭ-irumoli-y-eṇ*
Ṭaru-moli y-orṟoli tikkan tarāḷaṇ caka-munṟikum
Oru-moli y-ēṇai-viti kāra-lakkaṇattōṭu varum
Peru-moli y-āki-veku viriyaṇ moli-ṟ-ṟē-r-aṭaintē. (P. V. 24.)
- (4) *Kavibhis-saṭṭa-vidhas-syād-ityēvam karma-dhārayaḥ*
kathitaḥ |
Viśēṣaṇam pūrvapadē viśēṣyam tathōbhayaatrāpi
viśēṣaṇam ca
Yasyōṣamānam paratas-tadādāu sambhāvanā cā-
ṟyavadhāraṇā ca || (Var. Kār.)
Mun-moli-ṟ-ṟaṇṟu m-iru-moli-ṟ-ṟaṇṟu m-olintamainta
Ṭiṇ-moli-y-opṟoṭu mun-moli-y-opṟum ṟiṇakkon-ṟilā
Mun-moli-naṟ-karut tum-mun-moli-naṟṟunivum-eṇa
Nan-moli-y-ār-kaṇma tārayam-āṟeṇṇa nāṭṭinarē. (V.T. 5.)
Mun-moli-ṟ ṟaṇṟiru ṟaṇṟu vicēṭiya mun-moli-taṇ
Mun-moli-t tulliyam ṟiṇ-moli-t tulliya moy-kulalāy
Mun-moli-c camṟā vaṇai-y-ava tāraṇ amurṟum-ivai
Nan-moli-ṟ ṟaṇṟu-t tokai-k kaṇma tārayanaṟṟamilkkē. (P. V. 22.)

Here the author of the *Vīracōliyam* omitted the class where the noun qualified by the adjective stands as the first member of the compound (*viśēṣya-pūrvapadaḥ*) since, perhaps, it was difficult to him to find an example for it in Tamil language; and hence he stated that *kaṇmatārayam* is of 6 kinds, instead of 7 as found in Sanskrit. But the author of the *Pīrayōkavivēkam* has included it also and gives *teyva-ṟ-ṟulavaṇ-ṟiruvalluvuṇ* as an example for it.

- (5) *Yatrāvyayam pūrva-padam yathāvā*
Subantam-āhō dvītayam subantam |
Pūrvō pi mukhyō bahuśaḥ padārthaḥ
Tathāvyayībhāvam itirayanti.||
Sahi drandvaś-caturdhā śyāt budhair-iti viniścitaḥ |
Itarētarayōgākhyāḥ samāhārāhvayastathā. (Var. Kār.)
¹*Mun-moli-y-avviyañ-cēr tokai pēr-mun moli-t-tokaiyē*
Coṇ-moli-y-avviya pāvamaruvum tuvantuvamum
Van-moli-y-ām-ita rētarām-vāyuta camā-kāram-ām
Naṇ-moli-y-āṇ-urait tārkaḷ-camāca naru-nutalē. (V. T. 6.)
Mun-moli-p pēr-c-co l-ītai-c-co l-iraṇṭu muraṇi-nirṅum
Taṇ moli y-avvi yayīpāva m-ummai-c cakārattilē
In-moli-t tontaṇ ² camākārāt tōṭita rētarāmām
An-moli-t tōrramuñ camuccayat-tōṭu-man vācayamē.
(P. V. 23.)

- (6) *Tatpuruṣō aṣṭa-vidhō bhūt.....|*
Uttara-pada-janītārthaḥ prāyō mukhyaḥ.....||
.....dviguḥ|
Asyāpi paṇḍitair-antar-bhāvaḥ tatpuruṣō mataḥ ||
.....karmadhārayaḥ kathitaḥ |
Tatpurusāntarbhāvāt tadvad
Prādhanyam īritam cāsyā ||
Prādhānyam prāyaśōsmin
Ubhayōś syāt padārthayōḥ |
Sa hi dvandvaḥ.....||
Taṇpuru taṇ-ruvi ku-k-karma tārayaṇ rāmutaṇmai
Pirpata m-ām-clu vāy-ā m-orū-t-tokai peṇ-ṇ-aṇaṅkē
Murpata m-avvi yayīpāva m-oppu-murai piraluñ
Cor-patan tokkavai y-ellā mutaṇmai tuvantanukkē.
(P. V. 25.)

The statement ‘*avviyayīpāvamoppu-murai piralum*’ which means that the relative importance of the first or second member in *avyayībhāva* and *upamitasamāsa* will change, is made on the strength of the words *prāyaḥ* and *bahuśaḥ* in *uttara-pada-janītārthaḥ prāyō mukhyaḥ* and *pūrvōpi mukhyō bahuśaḥ*

1. He has not mentioned that class of *avyayībhāva* where the members are nouns, as *madhyēgāram* since such words have not been taken into Tamil language.

2. cf. Bhaṭṭoji Dikṣit's vṛtti on *cārthē dvandvaḥ*—
‘*samuccaya-anvācaya-itarētarayōga-samāhārāḥ cārthāḥ*.’

padārthaḥ respectively. The author of the *Vīracōḷiyam*, having dealt with this classification of compounds in 5 stanzas, mentions also the classification made by Tolkāppiyaṇār as the opinion of a class of Tamilians.

The only point of difference between these two kinds of classification is only with respect to *avyayībhāva* and *nañtatpuruṣa*, since other *tatpuruṣas*, *dvandva* and *bahuvrīhi* are identically the same as *vērrumaittokai*, *ummaittokai* and *aṇmolittokai*, though with different names, and *karmadhāraya* and *dvigu* may somehow or other be brought under *uvamaittokai*, *vinaittokai* and *paṇputtokai*.

4.23. Here I want to deal further with the difference of opinion among the commentators of Tolkāppiyam and Naṇṇūlār regarding *vinai-t-tokai* and *paṇpu-t-tokai* and whether the expression *nilaṇ kaṭantāṇ* is a *tokai* or not.

4.231. As regards *vinaittokai*, Iḷampūraṇar, Teyvaccilaiyār and Naccinārkkiniyar think, that when a present, past, or future, participle like *kollum* or *konra* is compounded with a noun like *yānai*, the participial suffix is dropped and they become *kol-yānai*. Hence the word *kol-yānai* means 'elephant that kills, that killed or that will kill'. But Cēṇāvaraiyar is of opinion that *kol-yānai* is compounded of the root *kol* with *yānai* and it cannot be dissolved into *konra yānai*, *kollukinra* or *kollum yānai*. The interpretation of the latter seems to be unsound, since Tolkāppiyaṇār in his sūtra says that *vinaittokai* shows time.¹ The reasons adduced by him in support of his statement do not seem to be sound. He has done so, since perhaps he took the expressions like *kol-yānai* as a case of *nityasamāsa* like the word *kumbhakāra* mentioned by Dharmakīrti in Vol. I, P. 181 of his *Rūpāvatāra*. But it seems to me that it is against the views of Tolkāppiyaṇār. Naṇṇūlār agrees with Iḷampūraṇar, while the author of the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* agrees with Cēṇāvaraiyar and repeats his arguments. (I. V. 338, Comm.)

4.232. As regards *paṇpu-t-tokai*, Cēṇāvaraiyar thinks that the words like *karuṇkutirai* cannot be dissolved into *kariyatū ākiya kutirai* in the same way as in *vinai t-tokai* perhaps for the same reason. This too is against the views of Tolkāppiyaṇār since, in the sūtra, he says '*innatū itu eṇa*' (Tol. Col. 416.) Naṇṇūlār seems to think that *karumai + kutirai* becomes *karuṇ-*

1. *Vinaiyiṇ rokuti kālat tiyalum*. (Tol. Col. 415.)

kutirai,¹ while Tolkāppiyaṇār thinks that *kariyatū + kutirai* becomes so. Naṇṇūlār's view does not seem to be sound since the expression '*karumai ākiya kutirai*' cannot convey any sense since *karumai* and *kutirai* cannot be appositional, *karumai* denoting quality and *kutirai* denoting object. The author of the Ilakkaṇa-vilakkam agrees with Cēṇāvaraiyar (I. V. 339, Comm.)

4.233. IS 'NILAṆ KAṬANTĀN' WHICH MEANS 'HE CROSSED THE GROUND', A COMPOUND OR NOT? All commentators of Tolkāppiyam, except Cēṇāvaraiyar and his followers think that *nilaṇ kaṭantān*, when it means "he crossed the ground," is not a compound, but a sentence consisting of two words *nilam* and *kaṭantān* where *nilam* is the object of the verb *kaṭantān* and it has its suffix dropped according to Tol. Col. 103. When it means "one who has crossed the ground," evidently it is a compound. But Cēṇāvaraiyar is very obstinate in considering it a compound.² The reason he adduces in support of his opinion is that in Tol. E. 133, Tolkāppiyaṇār has stated that a noun which has its case suffix dropped is combined with the following verb so as to form a compound. Iḷampūraṇar gives a different interpretation to the same. The lines under consideration are

Peyarum toḷilum pirintoruṅku icaip̄pa
Vērrumai y-urup̄u nilaipeṛu valiyun
Tōrram vēṇṭā-t tokuti-k kaṇṇum...

The literal translation of these is as follows :—Noun and verb used separately or together, either with the case suffix of the noun expressed or dropped. Iḷampūraṇar interprets these lines thus :—*Peyarum toḷilum vērrumai yurup̄u nilaipeṛu valiyum, tōrram vēṇṭāt tokutik kaṇṇum pirinticaip̄pa*, and *peyarum toḷilum verrumai yurup̄u nilai peṛu valiyum tōrram vēṇṭāt tokutik kaṇṇum oruṅkicaip̄pa*, which may be translated thus :—When a noun with, or without, a case suffix is followed by a verb and is treated as a separate word and when a noun with, or without, a case

1. *Paṇpai vilakkum moli-tok kaṇavum.*

Oru-porut̄ku irupeyar vantavum kuṇa-t-tokai. (Na. 365.)

2. *Nilai-kaṭantān, kuṇrattiruntān eṇa-p-peyarum viṇaiyun tokkaṇa oru-conṇirmai-y-ila-v-ākaliṇ tokai-y-eṇappaṭā v-eṇ-pārum-ular...vērrumai-y-urup̄ir roka-p-peyarun toḷilum oruṅkicaittal āciriyaṇ nērntār-ākaliṇ, avai tokai-y-ēṇavē paṭum.* (Tol. Col. 420, Cēṇā.)

suffix is followed by a verbal noun and is treated as a part of a compound of which the verbal noun forms the second part—According to his interpretation, *nilattai-k kaṭantān* and *nilaṅ kaṭantān* are each *two separate words* when *kaṭantān* is a *finite verb*, and *nilattai-k-kaṭantān* and *nilaṅ-kaṭantān* are COMPOUND WORDS when *kaṭantān* is a *participial noun*.

Cēṇāvaraiyar interprets the same sūtra thus:—*peyarum tolilum vērrumai y-urupu nilai peru valiṇum pirinticaip̐pa, peyarum tolilum tōrram vēṇṭā-t tokuti-k kaṇṇum oruṅkicaip̐pa*, which may be translated thus:—when a noun with a case suffix is separate from the verb which it follows, and when without case suffix, it is treated as a part of the compound—(i.e.) He takes ‘*pirintū*’ with the second line of the sūtra and ‘*oruṅkū*’ with the third line unlike Iḷampūraṇar who takes both the second and third lines with both *pirintū* and *oruṅkū*. Besides, Cēṇāvaraiyar seems to think that the word *tokuti* in the third line means compound, since the same word in the sūtra ‘*Viṇai-y-iṇ rokuti kālat tiyalum*’ (Tol. Col. 415) has that meaning. But the author has not used that word in that sense alone in the whole of his work. For he has used also in the sense of number according to Cēṇāvaraiyar and collection according to Iḷampūraṇar in the sūtra,

Inaitteṇa aṇinta ciṇai-mutar kiḷavikkū

Viṇai-p-paṭu tokuti-y-iṇ-ummai vēṇṭum (Tol. Col. 33).

It is a wonder to me why Cēṇāvaraiyar says so in spite of the fact that he is a sound Sanskrit scholar. What is the use of taking *nilaṅ kaṭantān*, *yāru kaṭantān*, *ūr-kaṭantān*, etc., to be compounds when one can very easily take them as separate words?

From the points mentioned above, it may be clear that the interpretation of *tokai* as ellipsis mentioned by Dr. Pope in page xvii of the Introduction in Pope’s edition of Tirukkural is not sound.

5. SYNTAX.

5. 1. INTRODUCTION: From the arrangement of the sections in Collatikāram, Tolkāppiyaṇār seems to have recognised that the unit of speech is a sentence. In the first section, *kiḷaviyākkam*, he says in the first eleven sūtras that the ending of the predicate must agree in gender, number and person with that indicated by the subject, and in the succeeding sūtras, he deals with the order of words in a sentence, the use of particular words in a context, etc. In the second section, the case suffixes and their function are dealt with, since the former are necessarily

found after nouns in a sentence. In the third section is mentioned the overlapping of case-functions and in the fourth, the vocative case. It is only at the beginning of the fifth section, *peyariyal*, Tolkāppiyānār defines *col* or word which forms a part of a sentence and classifies it primarily into two, noun and verb, and secondarily into four, noun, verb, *iṭaicol* and *uricol*. In the remaining portion of the fifth section, he deals with nouns; the sixth, seventh and eighth sections respectively deal with verbs, *iṭaicol* and *uricol* and the ninth and last, with miscellaneous topics like compounds, etc.

5. 2. *ORDER OF WORDS*: The normal order of words in a Tamil sentence is this:—The subject begins the sentence and the predicate ends it. (e.g.) *vāḷ valantara maruppaṭṭana* (The sword was stained after giving victory) (P. N. 4. 1.); the predicate may be used at the beginning of the sentence when it is emphasised. (e.g.) *kaṇṭanen kaṇṭinukkaṇiyai-k-kaṇkalāl* (saw I with eyes the ornament of chastity) (Kampar. C. Tiruvaṭi. 58.) As regards the cases, the sixth case must invariably precede the noun which it qualifies. (e.g.) *ālai-vāy-k-karumpiṇ tēnum* (the sweet boiled juice of the sugarcane at the mill), (Kampar. B. 469,) the second case generally precedes the verb, but the third and the fourth cases also intervene between them. (e.g.) *talaiyai vaṇaṅki* (bowing the head) (Cilap. 490, 33); *iṭamulai kaiyāl tiruki* (twirling the left breast with hand) (Cilap. 421. 43.); *vanta nampiyai muntai . . . nānmarai munikkukkāṭṭi* (having shown his brother to the sage learned in the four vedas) (Kampar. B. 233, 17.) When certain things are enumerated first and their total number is indicated by an enumerative word, such a word should be followed by *um*. (e.g.) *muracumuḷaṅku tānai mūvaruṅ kūṭi*. (all the three having assembled with their armies beating drums) (Pattu. 61.54). The past present, and future, participle invariably precede the noun which they qualify. (e.g.) *nutimaluṅkiya veṅkōṭṭāṇ* (with the white tusk whose end was blunted) (P. N. 4. 11). The nouns in apposition which denote the titles of persons generally precede the name of the person. (e.g.) *Teyvappulavan Tiruvaḷḷuran*.¹ If nouns and pronouns are used in the same sentence denoting the same person, the pronoun is generally used after the noun.

1. *Cirappi n-ākiya peyar-nilai-k kiḷavikkum*
Iyar-peyar-k kiḷavi murpaṭa-k kiḷavār. (Tol. Col. 41.)

(e.g.) *Cāttan avan vantān*, but the order may be inverted in poetry. (e.g.) *avan . . . cēntan pēr vāltti* (having blessed Cēntan) (Tol. Col. 32, Cēnā.).

5. 3. *NUMBER*: Singular nouns with a collective sense take the singular verb.—(e.g.) *zaiyātu ulakam* (the world will not despise) (K. 117); plural forms are sometimes used as honorific singulars.—(e.g.) *yām ēttukam palavē* (I praise in many ways) (P. N. 10. 13.); plural forms of verbs are sometimes used along with the singular nouns and *vice versa*.—(e.g.) *arāñ ceytīmō aruḷveyyōy* (P. N. 145, 7.), *yāvō yām kāṅkū* (Ka. T. Vol. 2, 497. 22.) Sometimes the plural forms of verbs are mixed with the singular forms. (e.g.) *uṅkum entai niṅ kāṅku vanticiṅ* (P. N. 125.4.) Sometimes two or more singular nouns connected by the particle *um* take a singular verb after them. (e.g.) *mātavar nōṇpum maṭavār kaṇpum kāvalaṅ kāval inṇi* (the celibacy and the chastity of holy women is not under guard) (E. M. 252, 208 and 209). *Oruvar* is the common form to denote either one man or one woman. (e.g.) *oruvarai-y-oruvar toṭantār* (one followed another) (Kampar C. Kiṅkarar, 25.) In case when one is not able to ascertain whether the person standing before him is a male or a female, the plural verb should be used. (e.g.) *āṇmakaṅ kollō peṇṭāṭṭi kollō iṣṭō tōṇṇuvār* (is it man or woman that appears there).¹ The plural interrogative pronoun *yār* is used after singular nouns if the former is used as a logical predicate. (e.g.) *ivan yār eṅkuvaiyāyiṅ* (if you ask who this man is) (P. N. 13.1).² Sometimes plural nouns are in apposition with singular nouns. (e.g.) *ēval ilaiyar tāy vayiṇ karipṇa* (Tol. Col. 461, Cēnā.)

5. 4. *TIṆAI*: Sometimes *aṣṛiṇai* nouns are used as *uyartiṇai* nouns and *vice versa* out of affection (e.g.) *eṅ-tantai vantān* (with reference to a calf), *eṅ āṇai vantatū* (with reference to a son). Similarly *aṣṛiṇai* nouns are used as *uyartiṇai* and *vice versa* to denote superiority. (e.g.) *centār-p-pacuṅkiḷiyār* (C. C. 1036.), *maṇṇan uyirttē malar talai-y-ulakam* (P. N. 186. 2.).

5. 5. *CONCORD*: The finite verb agrees with its subject in gender, number and person as is generally found in Sanskrit. If

1. *Pān-mayak kurra v-aiya-k kiḷavi*
Tān-ari poruḷ-vayir paṇmai kūral. (ibid. 23.)

2. If *yāvan* is abbreviated into *yāṇ* as *yāvar* into *yār*, its form would have been the same as the singular of the first personal pronoun *yāṇ* and hence *yār* may have been used in all genders and numbers to avoid confusion.

two or more subjects of different persons are used, the plural verb of the first person is used if the subjects are of the first person, and either of the second or third persons or both, as *yānum nīyum pōṇōm*, *yānum avanum pōṇōm* or *yānum, nīyum avanum pōṇōm*, and the plural verb of the second person is used if the subjects are of the second and third persons, as *nīyum avanum pōṇīr*. In respect of these two points there is similarity between Sanskrit and Tamil.¹ If the subject is made up of a *uyartiṇai* noun and an *aṣṛiṇai* noun, the verb that follows is in *uyartiṇai*. (e.g.) *Ponṇaṇum kutiraiyum vantārkaḷ* (Ponṇaṇ and his horse came) (Colloq.).

5. 6. PRONOUNS: Sometimes the word *ivan* is used to denote the first person singular. (e.g.) *kāṇkivan kaṭumpina-tiṭumpai* (P. N. 173.2). This is probably due to the desire of the speaker to address himself in the third person. The form *ivan* is used, but not *avan*, since he is the nearest third person to himself. This is perhaps the reason why *iṅku* is used in the sense of *enṇiṭattil* in Jaffna. Similar usage is found in the Cilappatikāram. (e.g.) *Parakati-y-ilakkum paṇṇu iṅku illai* (Cilap. 395, 85).

The reflexive pronouns *tāṇ*, *tām* and *tāṅkaḷ* are used in place of second person singular, *taṅkaḷ* when the person spoken to is a very great man, *tām* when he is great, and *tāṇ* when he is almost equal to the speaker in status. It is a peculiarity in colloquial speech that they are followed by a verb in the neuter singular. (e.g.) *tāṅkaḷ eppōtu vantatū*; *tām eppōtu vantatū*; *tāṇ eppōtu vantatū*. *Tām* and *tāṅkaḷ* are also followed by second person plurals of the form *vantīr* and *vantīrkaḷ* respectively. Sometimes *nām* is used instead of the second person honorific singular. (e.g.) *nammai orukāl kāṭṭivantāl* (P. T. 92. 1), *neru nal naṭantavarō nām* (Kampar. Āra. 238. 119). Such a usage is found in colloquial speech also. Similarly *atu* is also used in colloquial speech. (e.g.) *atu enṇa collukiratū*. Besides it may be interesting to note that the word *ivviṭattil* which is the seventh case of *ivviṭam* is used in the same sense. (e.g.) *ivviṭattil evvāru ninaikkinratū* (How do you think?). The form *evan* is used as a logical predicate after a neuter singular subject. (e.g.) *iccorṅku-p-porul evan*² (what is the meaning of this word?)

1. Cf. M. V. G. p. 290, S. 3.

2. *Yāteva n-enṇu m-āyiru kilavi-y-um*

Ariyā-p porul-vayir ceriya-t tōṇrum. (Tol. Col. 31.)

5. 7. *CASES AND CASE SUFFIXES*: The cases from the first to the eighth are generally used in Tamil as in Sanskrit conveying the same sense, *i.e.*, the first case denoting the subject, the second the object,¹ the third the instrument, object in association or the doer, the fourth the recipient, the fifth the limit, comparison and cause, the sixth the ownership, and the seventh the time and the place of action. But we have many cases where one case form is used for another, *i. e.*, where functional syncretism plays its part.

The *third*, the *fourth*, the *fifth*, and the *seventh*, case are some times used in place of the *second*. (e.g.) *vāṇāl nōkki vālum*²; *ivaṭku-k-kollum ivvaṇi*³; *paḷiyiṇ aṇcum*⁴; *aracarkaṭ cārntāṇ*, *kōṭṭiṇkaṭ kuraittāṇ*, etc. ⁵

1. Following point may be noted here. Tolkāppiyaṇār does not state in Tol. Col. 71 that the second case denotes the object, but says that it is used with verbs. Since he says in Tol. Col. 112 that the subject, object, instrument, etc., are necessary for an action to be produced and he directly mentions the meanings of all the cases other than the second in the sūtras dealing with the other cases and the object is left out, we are made to infer that the second case denotes the object. The authors of the Nēminātam and the Nannūl also have not definitely stated it. (N. N. Col. 17 and Na. 296.) It is the author of the *Ilakkaṇaviḷakkam* who has mentioned it. (I. V. 199.)

2. *Iranṭaṇ maruṇki nōkka nōkkam-a-v*
V-iranṭaṇ maruṇki n-ētu-v-u m-ākum. (Tol. Col. 93.)
3. *Itaṇa titu-v-iṇ renṇuṇ kiḷaviyum*
Ataṇai-k kollum poruḷ-vayi n-āṇum. (ibid. 110.)
4. *Acca-k kiḷavik k-aintu m-iranṭum*
Ecca m-ilavē poruḷ-vayi n-āṇa. (ibid. 100.)
5. *Karuma m-allā-c cārpeṇ kiḷavikkū*
Urimaiyu m-utaittē kaṇṇeṇ vērrūmai. (ibid. 84.)
Cinai-nilai-k kiḷavik k-aiyuṇ kaṇ-ṇ-um
Vinai-nilai y-okku m-eṇmaṇār pulavar. (ibid. 85.)
Kaṇral celavu m-onṇumār vinaiyē. (ibid. 86.)
Mutar-cinai-k kiḷavi-k k-atu-v-eṇ vērrūmai
Mutar-kaṇ varinē cinai-k-k-ai varumē. (ibid. 87.)
Mutaṇ-mu n-ai-variṇ kaṇ-ṇ-eṇ vērrūmai
Cinai-muṇ varuta relli teṇṇa. (ibid. 88.)
Mutaluṇ cinaiyum poruḷ-vēru paṭāa
Nuvaluṇ kālai-c coṇ-kurip piṇavē. (ibid. 89.)

The *fourth* and *fifth* cases are sometimes used in place of the *third*. (e.g.) *avar̥ku-c-ceyya-t-takum ikkārīyam*¹; *vanikattin āyinān*², *am̥pin āttutum* (Kampar. B. 28, 3.) The *sixth* case is sometimes used for the *fourth*. (e.g.) *nākaratu p̥ali*.³

The *fourth* case and the *second* case are sometimes used for the *fifth*. (e.g.) *cāttar̥ku neṭṭiyaṇ*⁴; *ninai-p-pānai nīnkum tiru*. (K. 519). The *seventh* case is sometimes used for the *sixth*. (e.g.) *kāttin̥kan yānai*.⁵

The *third* and *fourth* cases are sometimes used for the *seventh* (e.g.) *in̥marō ivvulakattānē* (P. N. 74. 3.); *nālvarkku maruvil an̥pinil vērrumai mār̥rināl* (Kampar. A. 216. 5.)

Another point to be noted is that *all nouns without any case suffix* may be used if they *precede* the verbs that they qualify; but *only the suffix* of the *second* case and the *seventh* case may be dropped if the noun *follows* the verb. (e.g.) *uṅkuvam p̥eruma nī nalkiya vaḷanē* (P.N. 136. 27.); *kaṇṭanen̥ varuval ... kāṭē* (P. N. 23. 22.)

The order of cases and their meanings are quite similar to what is found in Pāṇini's grammar. The parallelism between *'mūn̥rākuvaṭi ... viṇaimutal karuvi y-anai mutar̥ratuvē* (Tol. Col. 73.) 'and' *kar̥ṭṭkaraṇayōs t̥ṭṭiyā* (P. 2. 3. 18.)' is quite striking.

5. 71. As regards the *third* case and its suffixes there are a few points to be considered:—(1) The suffix that is mentioned by Tolkāppiyaṇar for the *third* case is *oṭu*;⁶ but he mentions *ān* in the *sūtra* *ku-ai ān-ena varū m-iruti . . .* (Tol. Col. 108) but does not state there that '*ān*' is the suffix of the *third* case. From the literature of the Sangam period it is determined as the *third* case

1. *Itana titu-v-ir r-en̥nuṇ kilaviyum*
Atanār ceyar-paṭar k-otta kilaviyum. (ibid. 110.)
2. *Mūn̥raṇu m-aintan̥un tōn̥ra-k kūriya*
Ākkam-oṭu punarnta v-ētu-k kilavi
Nōkkō r-an̥aiya v-en̥manār pulavar. (ibid. 92.)
3. *Ku-t-toka varūn koṭai-y-etir kilavi*
A-p-poru l-āraṭ kurittu m-ākum. (ibid. 99.)
4. *Itana titu-v-ir ren̥nuṇ kilaviyum*
Pāl-varai kilaviyum paṇpi n-ākkamum. (ibid. 110.)
5. *Āraṇ maruṇkin̥ vālcci-k kilamai-k-kū*
Elu m-āku m-ur̥ai-nilat tāna. (ibid. 98.)
6. *Mūn̥rā kuvatē*
Oṭu-v-ena-p p̥eyariya vērrumai-k kilavi
Viṇai-mutal karuvi y-anai-mutar̥ ratuvē. (ibid. 73.)

suffix, since it is used instead of *oṭu*. (e. g.) *tūṅku kaiyā n-ōṅku naṭaiya* (P N. 22. 1.) The later grammarians have taken it and its modified form *āl* as third case suffixes.

(2) The suffix *oṭu* in Tamil, when it denoted association, was used after the word denoting the *more important object*.¹ (e. g.) *tūmpuṭai-t-taṭakkai vāyoṭu tumintu* (P.N. 19. 10.); *māṇṭa-v-enmaṇaiviyōṭu makkalu nirampiṇar* (P. N. 191. 3.). Here it differs from Sanskrit where the third case suffix is used after the word denoting the *less important*. Cf. *sahayuktē apradhānē* (Pa. 2. 3. 19.) Besides, the suffix *āṇ* is also used in Sangam works to denote *association*. But later on, i.e., before or after the time Nannulār, the suffix *oṭu* alone came to be restricted to denote *association*.² and also it seems to have been used after the noun denoting the *less important*. (e.g.) *vanta nampiyait-tampi tannoṭu . . . kāṭṭi* (Kampar. B. 233. 17.); *kulaṇoṭu natikaḷ taṇ kuraikaḷ tīravē* (Kampar. B. 164. 46.)

5. 72. In this context the following statement of Dr. Caldwell deserves to be considered. "Dravidian Grammarians have arranged the case system of their nouns in the Sanskrit order, and in doing so have done violence to the genius of their own grammar. The Dravidian ablative of motion and the locative are evidently one and the same case, though represented as different by grammarians, in deference to Sanskrit precedents; and the Dravidian social ablative, as some have called it or rather as it should be termed, the conjunctive case, though it takes an important position in the Dravidian Languages has been omitted in each dialect from the list of cases, or added on to the instrumental case, simply because Sanskrit knows nothing of it as separate from instrumental. The conjunctive or social stands in greater need of a place of its own in the list of cases in these languages than in Sanskrit, seeing that in these it has several case signs of its own, whilst in Sanskrit it has none."³

This statement of Dr. Caldwell, so far as *Tamil* is concerned, is based on two points :—(1) Mention of *il* as the suffix both of the fifth and the seventh cases by the author of the Nannul and the modern usage of *iṇ* before *kaṇ* of the seventh case as in *ūriṇkaṇ* and (2) Dr. Caldwell's mistaking the third case suffix

1. *Oru-viṇai y-oṭu-c-co l-uyar-piṇ valittē*. (ibid. 91.)

2. *Mūnrā vataṇ-uru pāl-ā n-ōṭoṭu*

Karuvi karuttā uṭanikaḷ vataṇ-poruḷ. (Na. 297.)

3. C. D. G, 277 and 278,

oṭu to denote only association. His statement would have been correct if the author of Nannūl or more correctly his commentators had arranged the cases.

But the arrangement of the cases was done not by Nannūlār or his commentators, but by Tolkāppiyaṇār and his predecessors. Tolkāppiyaṇār does not at all give 'il' as any case suffix. He has stated that *in* is the fifth case suffix and that it denotes the limit or comparison and *kaṇ* is the seventh case suffix denoting time and place of action. Besides, in his time and even in later times, *oṭu* was used not only to denote association, but also to denote instrument in the same way as the suffix *āl* or *āṇ*. For instance, the sentence *koṭiyōṭu tuvakkunṭāṇ* means 'he was punished with a creeper and not 'he was punished along with a creeper'. Tolkāppiyaṇār has first stated that the suffix *oṭu* denotes the doer of the action, the instrument and then only that it denotes the association also. Besides *āṇ* also was used to denote association, e.g., *tūṇku-kaiyāṇ ōṇku naṭaiya*. (P. N. 22-1). Hence at the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār both *oṭu* and *āṇ* were used to denote instrument and association. The point why *oṭu* and *āṇ* were not treated as the suffixes of separate cases is fully discussed in Cēṇāvaraiyam, a commentary on Collatikāram of Tolkāppiyam under sūtra 74 of Collatikāram. Hence Dr. Caldwell's criticism on the arrangement of cases by Tamil grammarians cannot at all stand.

5. 7.3. The following parallelism may be seen in the use of cases between Tamil and Sanskrit:—

The third case is used to denote cause:

Tamil:

nalvinaiyāl avanai-p-pārtlen:¹

The fourth case is used instead of gerund in Tamil and instead of the infinitive of purpose in Sanskrit.

Tamil:

uṇavukku-c-cenrāṇ for *uṇṇa-c-cenrāṇ*³

*tōṭṭukku-p-pōṇ*⁵

Sanskrit:

*puṇyena tam apaśyam*²

Sanskrit:

bhōjanāya yāti for *bhōktum yāti*.⁴

*kuṇḍalāya svarṇam*⁶

1. *Inṇāṇ ētu*. (Tol. Col. 74.)

2. *Hētāu*. (P. A. 2.3.23.)

3. *Atarku uṭampatutal*. (Tol. Col. 76.)

4. *Tumarthācca bhāva vacanāt*. (P. A. 2.3.15.)

5. *Atuvāku kilavi*. (Tol. Col. 76.)

6. *Tādarthyē caturthī vācyā*. (Vārtika.)

The fifth case is used to denote contrast:

Tamil:

ivan avanin celvamutaiyōn

Sanskrit:

eṣaḥ tasmāt ādhyatarah¹

There is a case of nominative absolute in Tamil with a noun in the nominative case followed by a gerund, e.g., *mukantaṇar koṭuppa . . . uluvai porikkum ārralai* (P. N. 33. 6 to 9.) Here *koṭuttal* is the effect of his having been powerful. *malai peyya, kuḷam niṇaintati*. Here *peytal* is the cause of *niṇaital*. Similarly, the form *ceytena* is used instead of *ceya* in the above cases.

Such nominative absolutes are absent in Sanskrit; and the genitive and locative absolutes found in Sanskrit are absent in Tamil.

The author of the Pirayōkavivēkam mentions that ‘*pulli viṭāṇ pulaviyul*’ in ‘*pulliviṭā-pulaviyul tōṇrumennuḷḷam utaikkum paṭai*’ is a case of locative absolute in P. V. p. 26. Since the form in Tamil has no similarity to that in Sanskrit, I do not agree with him. It may be taken only as a case of nominative absolute.

Cēṇavaraiyar in his commentary under Tol. Col. 71 divides *ceyaṇṇaṭuporuḷ* or object into three classes. viz., *iyarraṇṇaṭuvatu* or that which is newly made, *veruṇṇaṭukkaṇṇaṭuvatu* or that which is transformed and *eytaṇṇaṭuvatu* or that which is obtained or reached. This is possibly the translation of the following Kārikā in Bhartṛhari’s Vākyapadīya:

*nivartyam ca vikāryam ca prāpyam ca trividham matam,
tatprepsitatamam karma . . .*

(Vākyapadīya, 3rd Kāṇḍa, 45th Kārikā.)

5.8. TENSES: The *past* tense in Tamil is used for the *present* or the future to denote haste² or speed e.g., *itō vanten* meaning ‘I am coming’ or ‘I shall come soon’. Sometimes the *past* is used for the *present* to denote certainty. e.g. *arīnten* for *arīkiren* (Ka. T. Vol. 2. 583. 7). Sometimes the *present* is used for the *future* as in Sanskrit³ e.g., *Parataṇē tūṇka māmuṭi cūṭukinrān*

1. *Pañcamīvibhaktē*. (P. A. 2.3.42.) ;

2. *Vārā-k kālattu nikalun kālattum
Orāṅku varūum viṇai-c-cor kilavi
Iṇanta kālattu-k kurippoṭu kilattal
Virainta poruḷa v-eṇ-manār pulavar.* (Tol. Col. 241.)

3. *Vārā-k kālattu viṇai-c-cor kilavi
Iṇappinu nikalvīnuṇ cīraṇṇa-t tōṇrum
Iyarkaiyun telivun kilakkuṇ kālai.* (Tol. Col. 245.)

(Kampar, A. 216, 4.) and *āgacchāmi* for *āgamiṣyāmi*.¹ The *future* is used for the *past* and *vice versa*.² (e. g.) *malar micai-y-ēkinān* (K. 3. Comm.)—here *ēkinān* is used for *ēkuvān*; *nilaiyal cevvitenpa* (Tol. Col. 68)—here *enpa* is used for *enranar*; *cetten* for *cāvēn* (T. V. 3. 165).

5. 9. *PARTICIPLES*: ‘Participles are of a two-fold nature in as much as they share the characteristics of both noun and verb.’ In form they are adjectives in concord. They not only govern cases like the verb, but also indicate time and differences of voice. The purpose that is served by relative pronouns in Sanskrit is served by the participles in Tamil.—(e.g.) ‘*kuṭattai-c-ceyta kuyavan vantān*’ corresponds to the Sanskrit sentence ‘*yaḥ ghaṭam akarōt saḥ āgataḥ*,’ which means the potter who made the pot came. The use of participles past, present and future is generally similar to that of participles in Sanskrit, though, in form, they are declined in the latter and they are not declined in the former. The use of participles denoting cause as *Harim paśyan mucyatē* (cf. *lakṣaṇahētvōḥ* (P. A. 3.1.126.) is not found in Tamil. The indeclinable past participle is used instead. (e.g.) *ariyai-p-pārttu vītu perrān*.

The Indeclinable past participles of the forms *ceytū*, *ceyyū* and *ceypū* are generally used to denote an action done by an agent previous to another action done by the same. Their use in Tamil is generally similar to the indeclinable participles in Sanskrit. The sūtras ‘*avarruḥ mutanilai mūnrum vinaimutan muṭipina* (Tol. Col. 230)’ and ‘*ceyten eccat tiranta kālam eytiṭa nuṭaittē vārāk kālam* (Tol. Col. 239)’ convey almost the same idea as ‘*samānakartṛkayōḥ pūrvakāle* (P. A. 3.4.21.) But sometimes these indeclinable participles in Tamil are used as absolutes, when their subject denotes a part of the person denoted by the subject of the finite verb. (e.g.) *kai irru avan vīlntān*. Very rarely are they used as gerunds. (e.g.) *nāvāy oṭṭi valitolil āṇṭa-v-uravōn maruka* (P. N. 66.1.) Here *oṭṭi* is used in the sense of ‘for steering’.

The gerunds of the form *ceyyiyar*, *ceyyiya*, *ceyarkū*, *ceytena* and *ceya* convey the same sense as the infinitive of purpose in Sanskrit. But there is difference in their use. In Sanskrit the

1. *Vartamāna sāmīpyē vartamānavadvā* (P. A. 3.3.131.)

2. *Irappē y-etirvē y-āyiru kalamuñ*

Cirappa-t tōnru mayāṅku-moli-k kilavi. (Tol. Col. 247.)

*infinitive of purpose always takes for its subject the subject, of the finite verb which follows.*¹ But in Tamil they may take the same subject or not.² In the latter case we have the absolute construction. (e.g.) *maḷai peyya, kuḷam niraṇṭatū.*

The form *ceyīn* is used to denote condition. Such an infinitive form is not found in Sanskrit. In the place of *ceyīn* Sanskrit has to use 'karōti cet.'

Similarly, the form *ceyīnum* is used in literature to denote contrast. It means 'though one does'. In its place Sanskrit generally uses an indeclinable participle followed by *api* as *kṛtvā api*.

In Tamil a number of finite verbs are used without the connecting particle. (e.g.) *vālttinen paravutum* (Pari. 70.83.); *nīr kaṇṭanen varuval* (P.N. 23.17.); *nī nalkinaṇai viṭumati* (P. N. 136.24.) In such cases, all the finite verbs except the last are taken to be indeclinable participles by the author of the Nannūl and the later grammarians.³

5.10. PECULIAR INTERPRETATION OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTIONS BY TAMIL GRAMMARIANS: 5.10.1. In the sentence '*nampi poṇ periyaṇ*' which means *nampi* is great on account of wealth, Caṅkaranamaccivāyappulavar, a commentator on the Nannūl says under the sūtra '*uyartiṇai toṭarnta . . .*' (Na. 377) that the word *nampi* is *uyartiṇai eluvāy* or subject and the word *poṇ* is *aṣṟiṇai eluvāy* and the latter is peculiarly followed by the *uyartiṇai* predicate *periyaṇ*.⁴ When one reads the sentence, it may clearly appear that something is predicated of *nampi* and not *poṇ*; besides the predicative element is not confined to the word *periyaṇ* alone. Hence under the general rules of grammar it must be taken that *nampi* is the subject and the compound word *poṇ periyaṇ* corresponding to Sanskrit *dhanamahitaḥ* is the predicate or *periyaṇ* is the predicate and *poṇ* is the enlargement of the predicate in the sense of *poṇṇāl*. If *poṇ* and *periyaṇ* are taken to be two separate words, it may be easily said that *poṇ* is third

1. *Samāna-kartṛkēṣu tumun.* (P. A. 3.3.158.)

2. *Eṇai y-eccam viṇai-mutal-ānum*

Ān-van tiyaiyum viṇai-nilai y-ānum

Tām-iyāṇ maruṇkiṇ mutiyu m-eṇpa. (Tol. Col. 232.)

3. *Viṇai-murrē viṇai y-ecca m-ākalum*

Kuṟippu-muṟ rīr-ecca m-ākalu m-uḷavē. (Na. 351.)

4. Na. C., p. 206.

case, with its third case suffix dropped according to the sūtra *Irutiyu m-iṭaiyu m-ellā-v-rupum*—*Neri-paṭu poruḷ-vayi nilavutal varaiyār*. (Tol. Col. 103) and the third case denotes cause as is sanctioned by the word *ēṭu* in Tol. Col. 74; or *poṇ periyān* may be taken to be a verb formed from a compound *poṇperumai*. The objection that is raised by Caṅkaranamaccivāyappulavar against the latter interpretation is that, in that case, it must have been *poṇperiyān* according to the rules of sandhi. Either this form may be brought under an exception, or the former interpretation may be accepted. It has a parallel in the sentence *avaḷ kaṇṇāl kottai* where the third case is used. Similarly *nampi poṇṇāl periyān* has assumed the form of *nampi poṇ periyān*.

If we carefully read through the sūtra '*uyartinai toṭarnta poruḷ mutalārum ataṇoṭu cārttin attinai muṭiṭina*' (Na. 377) Caṅkaranamaccivāyappulavar seems to voice forth the opinion of Naṇṇūlār. One is at a loss to know why Naṇṇūlār should have chosen to suggest that explanation. *There is, in my opinion, no sūtra in Tolkāppiyam conveying the same idea*; but I have come into contact with Tamil Pandits who think that this sūtra is based on Tol. Col. 61. It may be considered here whether it is or not.

5.101. The sūtra referred to is this:—

Kaṇṇum tōḷum mulaiyum piṇavum
Paṇmai cuṭṭiya ciṇainilaik kiḷavi
Paṇmai kūruṇ kaṭaṇṇā ṭilave
Tamviṇaik kiyaḷu meluttalaṇ kaṭaiyē (Tol. Col. 61.)

This may be translated thus:—The words denoting the limbs as *kaṇ*, *tōḷ*, *mulai*, etc., which generally denote more than one (*i. e.*) two, need not denote two except when they are followed by verbs suited to them, *i. e.*, neuter plural verbs. The examples which are given by Iḷampūraṇar under this sūtra are *kaṇ*, *nallaḷ*, *tōḷ nallaḷ*, and *mulai nallaḷ*. He has not stated that the subject, in such cases, is *kaṇ*, *tōḷ* or *mulai*. But the later grammarians and the author of Naṇṇūl seem to have mistaken *kaṇ*, etc., to be in the nominative case and hence the subject of *nallaḷ*, etc.

I would prefer to interpret the sūtra as follows :—The words *kaṇ*, *tōḷ*, *mulai*, etc., which refer to objects forming natural pairs do not invariably denote the pair unless they are followed by a plural verb. Hence it is not absolutely necessary that a woman

should have both her eyes beautiful to be described as *aval kaṇ nallaḷ*. Such a sentence would be appropriate even when one of the eyes was beautiful. To be more clear, I may take the example '*Kaṇṇaki mulai-y-ilāl*', which I have often heard used by recognised Pandits. It is known to every Tamil scholar that *Kaṇṇaki*, the heroine of the Cilappatikāram cut off one of her breasts and threw it away at Madura. Hence '*Kaṇṇaki mulai-y-ilāl*' does not mean that *Kaṇṇaki* is devoid of her breasts, but it means that *Kaṇṇaki* is devoid of one breast. Hence this sūtra does not deal with the form of words, but their meaning.

If such an interpretation is not given, I think that this sūtra is not necessary here and hence it may be omitted; for, it is certain that Tolkāppiyaṇār would have taken only *aval* as the subject of *nallaḷ* and hence the predicate *nallaḷ* agrees with the subject in gender and number.

One may question what the construction of *kaṇ* is, in '*aval kaṇ nallaḷ*' according to this interpretation. As I said in the case of the form *poṇ periyaṇ*, one may take *kaṇ* as a separate word in third case with the case suffix dropped, or may take *kaṇṇallaḷ* as a compound acting the part of the predicate to *aval*.

5.102. There are two more types of sentences where my explanation of the construction happens to differ from that ordinarily found in commentaries.

5.1021. '*Cākāṭum accu iṟum*' (K. 475) represents one of these types. On this Kural, Parimēlaḷakar writes that the verb *iṟum* which is suited to the word *accu* which denotes a part of the cart is used here as the predicate of the word *cākāṭu* (which denotes the whole). The sentence means 'the cart will have its axle broken.' Though it is the axle that breaks, the cart also may be said to break in its axle. Hence it seems to me that it is not absolutely necessary to take *iṟum* to be a *ciṇai-viṇai* or the verb suited to the *ciṇai* or part. Parimēlaḷakar has said so perhaps with the idea that *accu* is also a subject, as interpreted by Nannūlar. (Cf. *poṇ periyaṇ* supra.) It has already been said that it is against the ordinary ways of expressing one's idea. Hence, in this sentence, *accuṟum* may be taken as the predicate of *cākāṭum* or *iṟum* may be taken as the predicate and *accu* as the seventh case singular with the case suffix dropped.

6.22. '*Aḷattarkariyai aṟivum iṟamum*' (P. N. 20. 516.) represents another type. The commentator on Puṇanānūru says

that the *cinai arivum* and *iramum* have taken for their predicate *aḷattarkariyai*, the verb suited to the *mutal* or the person having *arivu*, *iram*, etc. It is evident that the word *aḷattarkariyai* is second person singular and means 'you cannot be measured', and the words *arivu* and *iram* are each neuter singular meaning knowledge and compassion respectively. Hence the sentence may be taken to mean 'you cannot be measured in your knowledge and compassion'. Since *aḷattarkariyai* is second person singular, the word *nī* may be taken as the subject that is understood and *arivum* and *iramum* may be taken as nouns in the seventh case with the case suffixes dropped, since the dropping of the seventh case suffix in nouns which follow the predicates is allowed by the sūtra

Ai-y-uñ kaṇ-ṇ-u m-allā-p poruḷ-vayin

Mey-y-urupū tokāa v-iruti y-āna. (Tol. Col. 105).

and such examples are found in plenty in literature.—(e. g.) *kaṇṭanen varuval...kāṭē* (P. N. 23.22.)—Here *kāṭē* means *kāṭṭ-inkaṇṇē*; *tikaittanai pōluñ ceykai* (Kampar. K. 247.78.)—here *ceykai* means *ceykaiyinkaṇ*.

Hence I think that it is not necessary to formulate, as is done by the later grammarians, that the words which denote parts of a whole may take predicates after them which are suited to the whole, and *vice versa*.

CONCLUSION.

It may be evident from what has been said that Tolkāp-piyanār clearly realised that Tamil was not related to Sanskrit either morphologically or genealogically and deftly exploited the ideas contained in the earlier grammatical literature in Sanskrit, particularly in those works which dealt with Vēdic etymology, without doing the least violence to the genius of the Tamil language. On the other hand, the large influx of Sanskritic elements in Tamil since the time of Tolkāp-piyanār appears to have so far clouded the linguistic vision of the author of *Vīracōliyam* that he was led to assume close family relationship between Tamil and Sanskrit. Further the author of *Vīracōliyam* does not appear to have realised that Tolkāp-piyanār's model was not Pāṇini so much as the *Prātiśākhya*s and the *Nirukta*. As a result of this important divergence in view-point, the *Vīracōliyam* proceeded to violently dragoon Tamil language and grammar into the

groove of Sanskrit—a feature which, in no sense, is traceable in Tolkāppiyam. It must, however, be conceded, in fairness to Vīracōliyam, that its author has brought within the scope of his grammar such changes in the Tamil language as had come about since the time of Tolkāppiyaṇār.

Naṇṇūlār was not a victim to the linguistic deflection which marred the value of the Vīracōliyam. While he adhered to the method of Tolkāppiyaṇār in respect of his fidelity to the genius of the Tamil language, he proceeded to complete the supplementing process initiated in the Vīracōliyam. A fateful periodicity appears to have characterised the line of Tamil Grammarians; for, the author of the Pirayōkavivēkam who came after Naṇṇūlār has lapsed with redoubled vigour into the Sanskritising groove of the Vīracōliyam.

But, luckily, the vitality of Tamil outlived all these grammatical vicissitudes. It is indeed gratifying that some of the latest grammarians—Vaittiyaṇātātēcikar, the Rev. C.J. Beschi and Civañānamuṇivar—have happily switched back to the healthy out-look and ideal of Tolkāppiyam.
